

THE  
ECLECTIC REVIEW

FOR MARCH, 1840.

---

Art. I. *Two Lectures on Education.* By GEORGE COMB. Edinburgh.

2. (*Art. 5. Third Vol. of Central Society of Education.*) *What are the Advantages of a Study of Antiquity at the present time?* By GEORGE LONG, Esq.

3. *On the Introduction of the Natural Sciences into general Education.* A Lecture by HENRY MALDEN, M.A., Professor of Greek in Univ. Coll., London. London: Taylor and Walton.

EDUCATION is a thing which concerns every body, and therefore, by a common fallacy, every body thinks he understands it, and thinks his own opinion on it as good as any one's else. Hence multitudes of persons, who have never made this subject their actual *study*, yet consider themselves at liberty to write (that is, to instruct the public) on it. Now, on the subject of gunnery, or dancing, or shooting, or military tactics, this is not the case; every one is not concerned in these, as he is in education; and hence it is not every one who has, or even thinks he has, an opinion on them. Education, however, is a thing which every one is in some way or other connected with or interested in; and every person, therefore, who has thought a little more than others about it, though he may never have *done* any thing at all in it practically, regards himself as competent to teach teachers how to teach, and to instruct instructors in the modes of instruction. But in education, as in religion, practice is as necessary as study; as Cicero says, '*non satis est habere virtutem, quasi artem aliquam, nisi utare.*' Act and you will learn. All preachment apart from practice, is mere *vox et præterea nihil*, worth nothing. Those,

therefore, who have had no actual experience in teaching, must, when attacking old and established methods, and proposing new ones, be regarded as visionaries and theorists,—well intentioned, no doubt, but at the same time weak and ill-advised; they may lay down principles, concoct plans, prophecy results, and jump to conclusions in their studies, which they never would have imagined in the atmosphere of the school-room: they may in their chair by the fireside entertain dreams of rapid improvement and unheard of acquirements, which the actual daily routine of class instruction would soon have dissipated: they may pleasantly draw out schemes for teaching the whole circle of the sciences—schemes *for teaching BOYS what few MEN know*, and half of which, when men, they would not care to remember, if they could,—schemes, which would never have entered into the head of an actual, working grammar schoolmaster. Persons of this description have not sprung up of late for the first time. The ancients had their educational visionaries, as well as ourselves; and with them frequently, as with us, the way has been led by men of the highest intellect, who, however, have lacked the one thing needful, the actual school experience. In one word, they have not been schoolmasters. Great men who have been schoolmasters (for any length of time), have seldom been educational visionaries; but great men who have not been schoolmasters, and yet have written decidedly on education, drawing out plans of their own, and proposing alterations in the present methods, have frequently been visionaries on that subject, owing sometimes to constitutional peculiarities and antipathies, and sometimes to personal quarrel, and sometimes to the exercise of mere imagination, excited by the largeness and extent of the subject, but unguided by the unerring rudder of experience.

It is melancholy to find the great Milton writing like an empiric on the subject of education. His letter to Hartlib is a signal instance of the inefficiency of mere speculation to the construction all at once of a good, practical, working system, especially where the material to work on is mind, and not matter; it is a monstrous notion that boys of ten and twelve should be able to understand the authors and subjects which were there proposed to be taught, and were said to be taught by Mr. John Milton. Imagine the lads in his academy in Aldersgate Street, who had scarcely ever seen an acre of ploughed land or a field of oats, ploughing through Columella and Varro de Re Rustica, while the great poet sat expatiating on the beauties of the country and the loveliness of nature, to boys, who ought to have been writing exercises on the rules of syntax, or drumming over the still earlier stages of the nouns, adjectives, and verbs. But while Milton's letter to Hartlib, so lamentably demonstrates the speculative absurdities of the author, how does his great poem by its side



give the lie to his assertions, and proclaim the superior value of a sound and thorough classical education. It is a curious fact too, mentioned by Vincent, and we will give it in his own words, that 'we know *nothing* of Milton's success as a schoolmaster, for 'not a name of all his pupils is upon record; but we do know 'that the brightest luminaries of the age issued from the school of 'Busby.'

In all the writings of the educational visionaries, we find pretty nearly the same trains of thought, and we may trace them home to the same fallacious and sophistical notions. It will *generally* be found that the writers in question take low views of education, as a mere preparation for business; although some, like Milton, regard it as a sort of process for making men angels, giving specious statements of its perfectibility, and warm anticipations of an era of ideal excellence. We propose in this paper to make some remarks on the principal fallacies which lead persons to form mistaken opinions of education as it is, and of education as it should be.

FIRST FALLACY. It is considered that education (as such, not knowledge, or science, but the art of educating) is in its infancy, and that results of which we can now hardly conceive may be expected from its more perfected development.

This notion is of course entertained only by persons who are not teachers, or have had but little experience in teaching; and therefore it might safely be dismissed as summarily as any of the numerous quack-specifics with whose pretended virtues ignorant people are deceived; we say it *might* be so dismissed, if it were not, that a notion seems almost to be entertained, though it may never have been brought out in words, that persons who are *not* teachers are the best judges of teaching, as a person who looks on at a game of chess often sees good moves which escape the eye of the player. The comparison is to a certain extent admissible; but after all, the looker-on might not play the *whole* game so well as the one who seems to him to make such oversights. So persons who look on upon the great work of education, may sometimes see things which escape the notice of the actual teacher, and *suggestions*, as of a patient to his physician, would be well received. But when persons wholly ignorant of the practice of education presume to dictate, or wish to dictate, to those whose *business* it is to educate, and who have had long experience in educating, they are certainly acting as they would hardly act even to their carpenter or bricklayer. If such a person had work to be done by a carpenter, and he were to propose a different way of doing it from that which the carpenter was going to adopt, and the carpenter replied, I have tried that, Sir, and it did not answer; or I have known that to be tried and it did not succeed; would he persist in his own notion, or give in to the carpen-

ter? If he had common sense, there is no doubt which he would do.

The advocates of the perfectibility of man and of education, are, we conceive, chiefly of two classes—either persons who are hostile to christianity, and look to education as the almighty instrument of the renovation of the world; or persons who are religiously disposed, possibly deeply imbued with the religious spirit, of benevolent feelings and somewhat enthusiastic temperament, who from *ignorance* of what has been, what is, and what in the nature of things must be, are led to entertain fancies which never can be facts, and hopes that never can be realized. It is a very curious fact, and it shows how extremes sometimes meet, that these two parties, though opposed in religious views, yet agree in their educational principles, admire one another's writings, and look upon one another as cooperating in the same work.\*

But wherein does the fallacy which we have mentioned above mainly lie?

It lies, we conceive, in this; in confounding education with mere instruction; in applying to morals, principles which are applicable only to intellectuals, and in imagining that the march of intellect is the march of education. Now, education, after all, has more to do with *mores*, morals, habits, with the habits of thought and action, than with mental acquirements. And unless we look at education from this point of view, we shall constantly err. It follows of course that in *teachers* also, or *educators*, to keep the cognate term, the moral *qualities* are above the intellectual *attainments*, the habits above the knowledge. A persevering teacher will make a persevering pupil, a slovenly teacher will make a slovenly pupil; and we may say in most cases, in the words of the old proverb, slightly altered 'like master, like boy.'

Well, in morals, in habits, it is not in the *power* of one generation to start where the preceding left off. If it were, the arguments of the perfectionists would hold. But every man, and, therefore, to a certain extent every generation, has to go through the same course. All are projected from the same level, and must still run the same career with about the same power, the same weakness, the same temptations, and the same difficulties. Each individual has to begin again for himself, and although he has the advantage of the transmitted experience of his predecessors, he still has to go over the very same moral ground as they did, and to re-acquire the very same experience as they. Thus, for example, when we have been describing on any occasion what

---

\* What is to be thought of a work on the 'Education of the Feelings,' from one who discards all religious *belief*?



we ourselves have felt under particular circumstances, we find at length that we have only been amplifying and commenting on some *old* proverb, in which the very same results were condensed. But for all that, the next generation will go through the same course, and will re-discover for themselves the same truths and findings as the present and the past. In intellectuals advances may be made: one man may stand on the shoulders of another, and see farther and know more. But in morals, and it is *chiefly* with morals (i. e., habits, character), as before stated, that education is concerned, it is not knowledge or sight that is wanted, but practice of what is known and seen. The same nature will ever reproduce the same feelings; and, as far as education is concerned, the same feelings will develop themselves in the same sequences of events, hope and fear, joy and sorrow, success and failure, virtue and vice, tyranny and rebellion, justice and wrong, all forms of hatred, and all forms of love. No training ever made a dove an eagle.

Now it is obvious that a schoolmaster two hundred years ago might have, and it is a fact, that many had, as high and competent qualifications for their profession, as any of the present day, or whom there is any reason to expect at any future day. It is true that they were ignorant of many facts in science and language, which later research has discovered, but what then? Did this diminish their power of making their pupils, like themselves, high-principled, punctual, persevering, resolute, firm? Did this, in fact, diminish their capability of forming a thoroughly great and good character? It is true their pupils were wholly unacquainted with discoveries which may now be put forth in an evening lecture to the lads of a common day-school. But were they less *able* to acquire any thing they wished to acquire? Had they less of that persevering *fag* without which there will never be any sound, accurate, or effective scholarship? Were they less acute, of less retentive memory, of inferior imagination, worse principled, less subordinate, less respectful? Let us not be misunderstood: we are not saying that these fresh discoveries in science ought not to be known (which would be absurd), or that they diminish the power of those who know them (which would also be absurd): what we say is this, that seeing that masters formerly produced as great characters, as great scholars, as great poets, as great divines, as great statesmen, as honorable merchants, as beneficent and benevolent noblemen as any do now, it may be concluded that the advances of science have *less* to do with the real and paramount objects of education than the system of discipline, the course of training, what we may call, the *gymnastik* of schools, which, not being dependent on any new discoveries of science or inventions of art, were as well understood by some of our forefathers as they can be by ourselves. And it may be concluded also, that no great



improvement in the grand results of *education* is to be looked for from the mere march of intellect or the mere advances of science.

SECOND FALLACY. It is considered to be a great waste of time for boys to spend several years in learning Latin and Greek, reading authors, writing exercises, and committing to memory, &c., when they will have no *call* for such knowledge in their future life, in business.

In reply to this there are several things which might be urged: such as, that boys *will* have calls for the knowledge they have acquired in learning Latin and Greek: or that there is no knowing how their tastes or circumstances may change, and that, therefore, it is presumptuous for us to say that they *will not* have any need for such knowledge, even though we now see no prospect of it. There is justice in both remarks, and they might satisfy some, especially those who were prepared for them, and antecedently well disposed to receive them. But on others they would produce no effect whatever; first, because you could not convince them that there *would* be any call for the knowledge in question: and if there was no call in actual shop or exchange business, it would be in vain that you would urge any other call, such as the constant demand in polite conversation for the treasures of literature, old and new; it would be in vain that you would state the marked and painful inferiority felt by what may be called non-Latin men in company with men of refined and cultivated minds, unless perchance a low and balatronic comicality shall have eaten out all higher tastes; we say, it would be in vain to urge any incidental or collateral, social or civil, benefits resulting from the knowledge under remark, because the pounds-shillings-and-pence man, the mere counter-and-till, or the mere counting-house-and-market man, has no sympathy with any thing of the kind, and you might as well argue to a stone wall. Secondly, you could not convince the objector that the boy's circumstances were likely to change, so as to give him any occasion for knowledge of such a kind. Indeed, he would consider it rather a drawback to him than otherwise. Such being the case, we conceive there is only one way of meeting the fallacy we are noticing, namely, by allowing that the knowledge acquired by a study of Latin and Greek *may* never be of any *actual* service or use in after life to the pupil, and yet maintaining, in spite of this, that the same course should be pursued, that boys ought still to be disciplined by the study of the classical languages, though they never should touch or look into a classical book after leaving school, though, when they have *done with* their Greek and Latin books (as boys talk), they may sell them for a song to the first second-hand bookseller they come to. This we maintain in its broadest form; and until people see this, they will have no clear

idea of what they are about in having their sons taught Latin and Greek. We are advancing no novelty: the best writers on education have maintained the same. Education is not, or ought not to be, the preparation for this or that business, but *the training of the mind and the forming of sound habits of thinking and acting*; which cannot be done by teaching first the thing to which all is to be ultimately *applied*, so well as by teaching something external and remote first, and then *coming* to the subject which more nearly concerns us. An example will illustrate our meaning. An experienced schoolmaster once, on receiving a new pupil, asked the father of the boy whether he wished him to be taught *book-keeping* (having heard that foolish wish expressed by many persons). 'No;' replied the parent. 'I don't care about that. He'll learn more of book-keeping in my counting-house *in a week* than he could learn in a school-room in *three months*.' 'That is the opinion I have always expressed,' rejoined the master. And all schoolmasters who are worthy of the name would probably feel the same, if they were not sometimes swayed by the dwaldrums and conundrums of ill-informed clients.

Latin and Greek are taught to boys at school not because they are to talk Latin or to write Greek letters to their friends, nor yet *because* (though it may be the case that) they are intended for one of the learned professions; but to *discipline* their minds, to gymnaze their intellects in hardy and robust exercises, to give them retentiveness of memory and promptness of recollection, accuracy of thought, diligence, perseverance, the *love* of work, or at any rate the *habit* of work, for the sake of *conquering the difficulties* of the work: for without this there can be no success. A system which presents no difficulties, is not a training system; it is a system of humoring, not of counteracting, lazy and ungenerous propensities; it is a system which, carried out to its legitimate extent, would destroy the root of all that is *yet* noble in our nature and still nobler in the aspirations to better it; it is a system which, till of late, it was never attempted gravely to defend; still less to urge as exclusively rational. A system of teaching which professes to rid learning of *all* difficulties, *does* rid it of half its charms: labor ipse voluptas. Is life all play? all game? Then why should education be? If we would have hard-working men, we must have hard-working boys. 'The child is father of the man.' We contend, then, that the *labor* of learning Latin and Greek, so far from being an objection to it, is one of its main recommendations. The classical languages are to be studied, not because they are *entertaining* merely, or amusing merely, but because they present difficulties, which *must* be overcome, and which there is a *way* of overcoming. The Latin grammar is to be learnt by heart, not because it is as amusing as the Arabian



Nights, but because in learning it the boy is *compelled* to work at something which he would not work at for *mere pleasure*, or mere entertainment; in fact, because it is laborious, and because, by exercising, it strengthens the powers of the mind.

This part of the subject has been so ably illustrated by Professor Malden in his Lecture, the title of which stands at the head of this article, that we cannot forbear giving his remarks in his own words.

‘Nothing is more common than to find parents regardless and insensible of the growing intelligence of their children, and complaining that they do not learn at school those practical processes which are to subserve the routine of their future profession. If the education of the body were the matter in question instead of the education of the mind, the absurdity of this conduct would be abundantly manifest. Put the case of a boy of a weakly constitution and effeminate habits; and suppose that family connexions and interest make it seem desirable that he should enter the army, and that he is committed to the care of some one,—an old soldier, if you like—who professes to prepare him for his military career. At the end of four or five years, when he ought to obtain his commission, his father may think it right to inquire into his fitness for his profession. ‘Have you studied tactics?’ ‘No, Sir.’ ‘Have you studied gunnery?’ ‘No, Sir.’ ‘Are you perfect in the last instructions issued from the Horse Guards for the manœuvres of cavalry?’ ‘I have never seen them, Sir.’ ‘Have you learnt the broadsword exercise?’ ‘No.’ ‘Can you put a company of infantry through their drill?’ ‘No.’ ‘Have you practised platoon firing?’ ‘No.’ ‘Can you even fix a bayonet in a musket?’ ‘I have never tried, Sir.’ After such an examination, we may suppose the father expostulating indignantly with the veteran under whose care his son had been placed. The latter might reply: ‘Sir, when you entrusted your son to my training, he was weak and sickly: he had little appetite, and was fastidious in his eating; he could bear no exposure to the weather: he could not walk two miles without fatigue: he was incapable of any severer exercise: he was unwilling, and, indeed, unable, to join in the athletic sports of boys of his age. Now, he is in perfect health, and wants and wishes for no indulgence: he can make a hearty dinner on any wholesome food, or go without it, if need be: he will get wet through, and care nothing about it: he can walk twelve or fifteen miles a-day: he can ride: he can swim: he can skate: he can play a game of cricket, and enjoy it: though he has not learnt the broadsword exercise, he fences well: though he has never handled a soldier’s musket, he is an excellent shot with a fowling-piece: he has a firm foot, a quick eye, and a steady hand: he is a very pretty draughtsman; he is eager to enter his profession, and you may take my word for it, Sir, he will make a brave and active officer.’

‘Such a defence, I think, would be conclusive. So it is with mental training. Mental health, and vigor, and activity, are a sufficient vindication of the discipline by which they are produced, although the



acquirements necessary for a business or a profession may have been delayed in the cultivation of them. There is no profession, no station in life, in which a love of intellectual exertion, a habit of attention, a retentive memory, a quick discernment, a comprehensive capacity, clearness of views, and soundness of judgment, a knowledge of the use of knowledge, that habit of mind, in short, which by experience and reflection gathers wisdom, is not far more valuable than any amount of mere knowledge.'

The fallacy, however, which we have been discussing, is founded mainly upon another, which must be considered separately.

**THIRD FALLACY.** It is considered that teaching Latin and Greek is teaching words merely, and not things; which, it is contended, is inverting the order of nature, of propriety, and of use.

This is stated in so many words by Pestalozzi and his disciples, by George Comb and the Scotch phrenologico-educational school, and is dwelt on by Mr. Wyse in his work on 'Education Reform.' It is not a new conceit; it was the favorite maxim at the time of the French Revolution, and the leaven has spread to Germany, as well as to our own country. The Polytechnic schools were to teach things, and not words only; and the Real-schulen of Germany profess a similar object. Men had *formerly* been taught to think that the young should be accustomed from early years to a familiarity with virtuous and heroic thoughts, with stirring histories, and ennobling poesy: our forefathers, good people, had, in their simplicity, imagined that the praise of integrity and justice, the condemnation of meanness and vice, the study of the sublime and beautiful in language inseparable from the sublime and beautiful in thought, the narrations of the deeds of war and the arts of peace, the struggles of human passion, the alternations of power, generosity towards the vanquished, the feeling never wholly extinct of a Power holding the smaller circles of human change in subordination to a grander cycle comprehending all time, these they conceived to be the proper objects of youthful study. They thought that man was the proper study of man: man in all his mental and moral developments, especially the nobler and more dignified. They considered that an oration of Demosthenes or the *Æneid* of Virgil was a better school for training the mind in than a treatise on pneumatics or a catechism of farriery. They imagined that history, and oratory, and poetry, would cultivate the mind, and discipline it for virtuous and noble acts better than all the diagrams of Euclid. The contemplation of men with their hopes and fears, business and pleasure, greatness and littleness, they thought more effectual in educating men than any of the sciences, even geometry, with its circles and its radii, its angles and its squares. Not

that they disparaged geometry or any other of the sciences, they valued them too highly to put them in an unnatural position, or to assign to them an office which they knew they were unable to perform. The great Barrow,\* whose inexhaustible eloquence never flows in a richer stream than when he is extolling the mathematics, himself no less illustrious as a scholar than he was as a mathematician, never dreamed of science supplanting literature; each had its proper functions, and its appropriate vocation, and he would not have sanctioned an interference of the claims of the one with those of the other.

But we are wandering from the fallacy which we have proposed to consider. What is meant by teaching words and not things? An example given by Mr. Comb in his first lecture (p. 19) will sufficiently explain what is intended. Mr. Comb conceives that it would be more useful to teach a boy the points of a horse than to teach him that the Latin of 'horse' is *equus*, the Greek ἵππος, the German *pferd*, the French *cheval*, and so on. The one would be what he calls *real* knowledge, the other merely verbal knowledge. Now, this we wholly and entirely deny. We contend that to the majority of boys, to nine boys out of ten, teaching the points of a horse and the various uses of the limbs, and muscles, &c., would be little else than teaching *words*, words denoting in many cases things with which they are not familiar, mere hard names. Of course, if no new words were given, the boy would learn nothing. It would be no use to tell him a horse has four legs, a tail, two eyes, two ears, &c.; he can see this as well as we can; this would be what they call an object lesson; and to a boy who is not an idiot, an object lesson is either mere waste of time in frivolous questions and frivolous answers, or the communication of certain hard names. But to return to Mr. Comb's horse. We deny that it would be at all a good discipline for a boy's *mind* to teach him the points of a horse: and we maintain that it is an excellent discipline to make him learn the declension of *equus*, and decline other words like it. We maintain that it is a far more useful exercise for a boy to read and work out the meaning of a Latin sentence, and to form another sentence by rules deduced from that, imitating, and, therefore, necessarily closely observing, the peculiarities of construction, and thus building up a period of good sense and good grammar: we maintain that this is a far more useful exercise than to be telling the colour of this animal or the height of that, the name of this mineral or that plant,—more useful than to be distributing the weeds and plants of the back-garden into endogens and exogens,

---

\* Educated at the Grammar School of Felsted in Essex, before he went to Cambridge.

cotyledons and dicotyledons, or to be discussing tertiary strata and primitive rocks, alluvial and diluvial deposits, or the fossils of the ecthyosaurus and the Plesiosaurus. But there are some who would not introduce many of the sciences formally, but would give familiar lessons on the most familiar objects which come before us, such as glass, india-rubber, coal, bricks, shells, &c. And such lessons are called object lessons. But what does all that is taught in such lessons amount to but *mere observation*? And who, that has eyes, has any *difficulty* in observing what he wants to observe? No one would be simple enough to *teach* a boy of ten that a table has legs, or that india-rubber is elastic, or that he cannot see through a brick wall; and why? Because he *must* have learnt this of himself, by the unavoidable observation of every day life. And yet there are people who would actually have the precious hours of school instruction frittered away in such rubbish as this. Object-lessons is the term commonly employed to *describe* them, or rather to *conceal* their intrinsically empty and vapid nature. 'It should ever be remembered,' says the learned Dr. Vicesimus Knox, 'that a great part of things around us, glaring *objects* of the senses *obtrude themselves* on the mind spontaneously; and that it is *ridiculous* to include such things in a course of education. Man, like the animals around him, learns by the use of his eyes only, an infinite number of things not to be found in books, because *they are obvious on intuition.*' Yet some educational zealots would fain have rejected the classics, and all institution in language for this wretched drivelling, this apology for work, in teacher and scholar. Pestalozzi and a host of successors in his wake, have raised a hue and cry in favor of this sort of instruction. We can only say we never saw a class of boys of the most moderate abilities who would not have thought their object lessons beneath contempt. One remark, however, should be made on the mode of investing the lessons with something like an appearance of information. The most difficult terms are used to describe the most common properties of the most common objects, —terms, denoting, *things* indeed, which they understood long ago, but terms which they cannot now understand without much explanation. So that in fact, in such lessons they are not learning things; the things they knew before; but they are learning the meaning of a set of hard, crabbed words which they never saw before, and which they might as well not learn.

Whereas in language they learn things. The words are the things. They treat the words *as* things. They strip them of their terminations, they add prefixes, they add suffixes, they decline them, they conjugate, compare, make them agree with one another, classify, arrange, and collocate the whole. In fact, words



are objects, and *the* objects with which they are most familiar, and on them they exercise their memory, ingenuity, fancy, and all the powers of their mind. We are glad again to have the opportunity of confirming our opinions by the admirable and lucid statements of Professor Malden.\*

'The pupil goes on reading and hearing of animals, and plants, and minerals, which he has never seen, and machines which he has never handled, and manufactures which he has never witnessed, of lemures, and cuttle-fish, palms and eucalyptuses, selenite and steatite, and, it may be, even of divers protochlorides and dentoxides; and the teacher boasts that he is teaching things, while all with which he is loading the memory is mere words. Even in the most simple and elementary teaching of things after the Pestalozzian model, it is much more easy than theorists are aware of, to fall into this error. There is a little book in great vogue, and of considerable merit, the '*Lessons on Objects*,' as given in Dr. Mayo's school at Cheam: but I never yet saw this book in the hands of a teacher without finding that the little pupils during the greater part of their lessons were not really learning the properties of glass, or chalk, or copper wire, but were in fact learning the meaning of sundry hard words, such as 'transparent, opaque, friable, malleable, ductile, insipid, sapid;' very useful knowledge, no doubt, but not exactly knowledge of things.

'But when a boy is learning Greek or Latin, the words themselves are the things with which his mind is busied, and these he has perpetually before him. He is not merely told about them; but he sees them, reads them, pronounces them, writes them, uses them. Every classical book that he reads is to him and his master an inexhaustible museum of them: he is always trying experiments with them with more or less success, analysing and compounding, that is, translating and writing exercises: and thus the ideas which he conceives of their formation and analogies, their derivation and composition, and the laws of their structure in sentences, attain at last to the distinctness and precision which belong to the ideas of objects with which the mind is immediately and practically conversant. In the spirit, if not in the letter, this is a study of things. And this I believe to be the cause, why the study of the ancient languages, even in those who do not carry it far enough to make much progress in the literature, is found, by an amount of experience which no theory can countervail, to be most beneficial in developing and strengthening the intellectual faculties.'

It is amusing to see how the visionaries, while on the one hand they all agree in their hostility to Latin and Greek, differ as to what should be put in their place. They are in favor of the sciences, as we have been saying. But as to how or by what

---

\* On the Introduction of the Natural Sciences into General Education. A Lecture, &c. By Henry Malden, M.A. Taylor and Walton.

means they are to be taught in detail, or even which of the sciences should be taught, or which first and which second, hardly any two will be found to think alike. One thinks chemistry the most important, another gives the preference to geology or botany, he is not certain which, a third thinks anatomy and physiology more necessary than any thing else, a fourth agrees that science is the right thing, and astronomy the right science.

It is no wonder that such diversity exists, seeing that the parties in question have no one common leading idea by which to steer. One science will appear to one more *useful*, and another to another, and a third to a third. But if a person takes the low view of education which regards it as a mere preparation for the office or the counting-house, and would make every thing that is learnt bear directly upon that, be *useful*, as they call it, in after life, it is not possible to answer him or to satisfy him. His notions on the subject must be broken up altogether before he can form a correct opinion on it at all. The Romans described an ignorant person as one who *nec literas didicit nec natare*. Walter Scott, when asked respecting his son's education, replied, that he had taught him 'to ride, shoot, and speak the truth,' like the ancient Persians. Now, both ideas contain more than at first sight would appear. The Romans educated the mind and the body: the Persians chiefly educated the body and the moral habits. Some people have very strange notions on what they consider the chief part of education. One person gravely considers dancing to be the principal thing: another regards the three *r*'s—reading, 'riting, 'rithmetic—as the main *ingredients*: a third would give nothing for all besides if the *globes* were neglected. Now, there is no prospect at all of convincing persons of this kind that Latin and Greek are the best instruments of education, until they can be brought to see that mental *training* is the object, not mere knowledge, as in drilling, firmness of muscle, and an erect gait, are the *ends* to be attained, not any particular posture which may be required as a *means* for attaining them. A boy is not taught drilling that he may mark time in the middle of Cheapside, nor is a boy taught the Latin grammar that he may decline *magister* in his father's counting-house. A boy is not taught dancing in order that he may dance a hornpipe in the public street, but that he may acquire a suppleness of limb and an ease of manner. The thing taught is the medium by which we reach the end. *Latin and Greek are taught not as ends, but as means*. By them, as by an instrument, we develop and strengthen the intellectual faculties. Learning Latin and Greek is the ἐνέργεια, mental power the ἔργον. Now, 'the study of the 'ancient languages,' says Professor Malden, 'even in those who 'do not carry it far enough to make much progress in the literature, is found by an amount of experience, which no theory can

'countervail, to be most beneficial in developing and strengthening the intellectual faculties.'

But do we mean to admit that no actual knowledge will be gained by the pupil, which will be useful to him afterwards, if he is judiciously trained in the ancient languages? By no means. What we say is this, that that knowledge is only an *advantage* attending one of the *means* which we use to the great end: and is not the end itself.

There is one other point in the argument about words which we wish to notice. Listen to a zoologist, an astronomer, or a chemist describing the respective objects of his chosen science: what does all that he is saying amount to? To words and figures: language and quantity. Is it not then most reasonable to teach these two things accurately and minutely even with an ultimate view to the sciences themselves? Language is not only the symbol, but the very instrument of thought, and mixes itself up with all our mental operations, coloring our thoughts and insensibly moulding our opinions. Now, a person who has never studied language accurately, not only can never express himself accurately, he can never think accurately, he cannot form to himself a clear notion often of what he thinks he means, he has not the skill to analyse his thoughts, because he cannot fix the *precise* meaning of his words. Words are not merely the *raiment*, they are part of the *body* of one's thoughts. So that, antecedently, one would say, that *language*, some language or languages, ought to form the staple of education, the great instrument of mental cultivation.

FOURTH FALLACY. It is considered that nothing should be learnt by mere rote, but that every thing which is learnt, should be explained at the time.

Of late years we have heard a great deal of the advantages of explaining every thing in teaching, of leaving no difficulty unsolved, and of not allowing children to *learn* any thing which they do not at the time thoroughly *understand*. We can hardly take up a single book, which has been written within the last ten years on the subject of education, in which this notion is not adopted and insisted on. The way in which the advocates of the all-explaining system love to express themselves is somewhat of this kind, 'that children should not be mere parrots, learning by rote page after page, the force and beauties of which they cannot enter into; poring over the drilled dull lesson,' as they call it, 'while the reasoning powers are but little exercised, and in fact the mind is enslaved to a sort of mechanical drudgery and routine, to be pitied by any reasonable being.' All this rests on a fallacy, which may be readily seen. In order to *understand one* thing, we must *know twenty*; and if the *one* is *explained* to us without our *knowing* the other *nineteen*, we are as



much learning the *explanation* by rote, as it is called, as we should be the *one* thing itself. We must learn much *more*, or we might as well have learnt less. We know many facts now perhaps as facts, which at present are inexplicable, but which something we may learn a year hence will probably make clear. In every thing *practice* comes first, *thought* after. Reflection is altogether a subsequent act. It does not follow, because a child does not seem to enter into the *meaning* of what he learns *now*, though he learn it ever so perfectly, it does not follow that he never will enter into it. Because, when you have put a seed in the ground, a plant does not immediately rise, with its green stem and leaves, it does not follow that it never will rise. It requires time, and rain, and sun. So with knowledge. Byron says, in speaking of his juvenile studies,

‘ *Time* hath taught  
My mind to *meditate* what then it *learned*.’

A few instances will show the advantages of attending to this principle. An eminent scholar of the day acquired great familiarity with Homer and skill in the Greek language by reading the Iliad through, without a lexicon, reading straight forward, marking the words which he did not understand, and passing on. As he proceeded, words which he had marked before explained themselves by their recurrence and context, and when he arrived at the end he had comparatively very few words left unexplained. Of course he knew a good deal of Greek, when he began. We know a gentleman who read a Portuguese book of travels in this way, without having any previous knowledge of the language; but he understood nearly every thing before he had finished. Of course he knew Latin and French. But the principle is the same, he used no dictionary. Often the meaning of something we heard years ago, but did not at all comprehend then, *flashes upon* us all at once. Nothing, in fact, is more absurd than objecting to children learning any thing by rote. Was not much of our own most valuable and most indelible knowledge acquired, when we did not understand the meaning of what we learnt? Have we not found lessons originally got off by the merest rote exceedingly useful in after life? Do we not often hear persons say, ‘I learnt so and so when I was at school, and I have never forgotten it,’ and that at a distance, it may be, of ten, twenty, thirty, forty, or fifty years. The fact is, learning by rote is the *only* way of learning a multitude of things, which must be learnt. How is the multiplication table learnt in the first instance, but by rote? We may reason upon it and analyse it afterwards, but this is altogether a subsequent act. We get the thing first in its totality, and afterwards separate and survey the parts.

This principle may be profitably applied to religious education. How absurd is the objection to teaching religious doctrines which

children cannot comprehend ; of which they cannot see the scope or ascertain the bearing ! How crude the notion that doctrinal teaching is a mere inefficient and bald recital !

‘ For if some tones be false or low,  
What are all prayers beneath  
But cries of babes, that cannot know  
Half the deep thoughts they breathe ?

‘ In His own words we Christ adore  
But *angels*, while we speak,  
Higher above *our* meaning soar  
Than *we* o’er *children* weak.’\*

We are not saying that the bearing of doctrines on feelings and conduct should not be gradually elicited and enforced : of course it should : what we say is, that doctrines must be taught *as* doctrines, dogmatically, as much truths and axioms as the results of the multiplication table. Thus truth is beforehand with error : the mind is preoccupied, and is not left open, and free to hostile incursion. It is armed, and defends itself.

This leads us to the consideration of another fallacy, which refers more particularly to the education of youth than of children, but which may be advantageously regarded in connexion with the observations we have already made.

FIFTH FALLACY. It is considered, by some, that on a subject of morals or religion (the latter more especially), the different conflicting opinions should be given, and the pupils left to choose between them.

We believe that this notion is entertained by many who do not know that they entertain it. They have never brought it out in form to their own consciousness, or reduced it to words. If it were *stated* to them, they would reject it. They, however, consider it more liberal and candid, and more generous-minded, to leave the pupil to make an impartial and dispassionate choice : such a course is complimented as truth-loving. If analysed, the notion will come to something of this kind, that principles are like wares, that they can be taken on approval, and if not liked returned. Such, however, is not the case : the mind is in reality somewhat differently affected from a beer-cask. Yet even a beer-cask smells of beer, a long time after the beer is gone.

‘ Quo semel est imbuta recens, servabit odorem  
Testa diu.’—Horace.

A bad principle is not easily changed for a good one. On this, as on many other subjects, Plato was wiser than many moderns.

---

\* Christian Year.

'There is much greater danger,' he says,\* 'in buying knowledge than in buying food. For he who purchases eatables or drinkables of the retail or wholesale dealer can carry them away in *other* vessels, and *before* he eats or drinks them, can take them home, and there call in some skilful person and advise with him, that he may know what he ought to eat or drink, in what quantities, and at what times: so that the danger is not great in purchases of this kind. But knowledge it is not possible to take away in *another* vessel: he who buys knowledge must take it into his very soul, and there keep it, and must go away either injured or benefitted.'

When people speak therefore of placing two sets of opinions before others, one calculated to do evil and the other good, with a view to their making a choice, an unbiassed and impartial choice (as they call it), between the two, they are acting as they would, and reasonably would, if the subject of examination were butter or bread, instead of principles. But the cases are widely different. They act in reality as a person would, who might induce another to take a glass of port wine and a glass of vinegar to see which he preferred, or which he thought the more wholesome. One would be calculated probably to do good, the other certainly to do harm: but the former would not neutralize the latter. Perhaps if this idea were applied to the subject of prejudice, many sentiments which are called bigoted would be found to be only prepossessions in favor of what is good; and it might be difficult to show that such prepossessions, call them prejudices if you like, should be discouraged.

Education has two main divisions, *teaching* and *discipline*. Now, it will be found that the principles adopted in the one, will always affect the other, and so to speak, the discipline will be a reflection of the teaching and the teaching of the discipline. The one will be the correlative of the other. Strict requirements in learning, will go with strict requirements in behaving. By strict requirements in behaving, we do not mean curtailing the liberty of the pupils in every possible way, and keeping up a perpetual fire of small shot at them, but the strict requirement of certain grand points of behaviour, and strict discipline in school. This leads us to consider another fallacy, the last which we have space to discuss at present. It respects discipline.

SIXTH FALLACY. It is considered that children should be ruled rather by persuasion than authority, and should be shown the reason *why* they should do one thing and not another.

This opinion sounds so benevolent, it is entertained by persons so well-meaning, and seems so humane, and kind, and generous,

---

\* In the Protagoras.



that at first sight it appears almost unfeeling to do any thing to unsettle it, still more to refute it altogether. It seems to be based upon love in opposition to fear, and appeals seemingly to the better and more generous sympathies of our nature. But for all that we must look at it closely, and see whether it will bear examination.

When we order a child to do a particular thing, and begin to argue with him to show him *why* he should do it, we put his obedience on a wholly different ground from our will or authority; we put it on a different ground *to him*, and a ground which he can take as well as we, and which he will not be slow to take. We put his obedience on the ground of his *seeing* the reasonableness of our order. Now, often he will *not see* the force of our reasoning, and if he is unwilling to see the force of it, of course he will not see it. Well, one of two things, then, must follow. Either we must give in, which would be yielding to the child's self-will, and would be ruinous to all authority; or we must still insist on his doing what we ordered; we must after all fall back on our authority, and then *seem* to the child to be enforcing what was unreasonable. In other words, whenever the child does not see the force of the reasons we assign, we must appear to him either weak or capricious, either yielding and pusillanimous, or arbitrary and tyrannical; either the child becomes practically master, or we become apparently unjust.

Of course, the mere theorist or *writer* on education does not see this. How should he? But let him have the responsible management of a hundred boys for six months, and then say whether he would be content to place his system of discipline on the ground of persuasion. If he did, the boys would soon ride upon his back. We never knew a practical schoolmaster of any *experience*, to entertain the notion under remark. Some parents entertain and act upon it, if that may be called acting, which rather consists in suffering. They say of a son, 'we never oblige him to do what he does not see the propriety of doing, we endeavour to show him the reason *why* he should do this or that.' They seem to have forgotten, that when they have given an order, they have given what ought to be the *strongest* motive for obedience, and that by adding *other* motives, inducements, persuasions, and coaxings (for it soon comes to that), they are, in fact, only *weakening* the grand motive and habit of obedience, and encouraging the arts of dissimulation and hypocrisy. Obedience is prompt; and unless prompt, is as much like disobedience as it can be.

The truth is, a child is in very few cases *able*, in the nature of things, to *see* or comprehend the *whole* of the reasons for what he is told to do. He may see one part of the reason for a thing,

but not the other part, and may think that part which he does see very insufficient, as indeed it often would be. Do all you can, you may not be *able* to explain to him the other part, possibly it might not be proper to explain it to him. The child must know a great deal more, and act and obey a great deal more, before he will be able to take in and appreciate the *real* reasons of half of what he is ordered to do. Let him do what he is told, and after a time he shall find that it was right. This is the principle of all virtue, as well as of religious obedience. Action precedes and accompanies knowledge. In education there is great need of faith; faith on the part of the master or parent that the seed sown will not be choked, but will be fruitful of good; faith on the part of the child, towards his master or parent, that what he does or orders is for his good, and will prove so in the end. This is the true principle of a child's obedience. This is the ground on which it is placed by Scripture, by common sense, and by universal experience.

A parent sometimes directs a child to do a particular thing, and then assigns a reason why he should do it. The child hesitates, objects, argues; at last the parent will say, 'Well then, do it because *I tell you*.' If this had been said at first, it would have saved much trouble and many words. So, a master should never argue with a pupil; never allow a boy to answer again, reply, ask reasons, and so on. All this is out of place, and detrimental to good order and healthy discipline.

But, it may be asked, would not these principles encourage arbitrariness and tyranny on the part of masters? On the contrary, a master (if what he ought to be, which is of course presupposed), finding his responsibility so great, will take the greater pains to be in the right; finding that whatever he orders is to be done, will not order what is unnecessary, or unjust; finding his pupils submissive towards him, will be lenient though strict, and kind though authoritative, towards them. And this is what boys themselves always prefer. There is nothing they hate so much as an uncertain, vacillating, capricious discipline; no master is so much respected as one who *will* be obeyed, and who keeps them in strict order and up to the mark. Boys do not really like confusion any more than men; they like order and regularity, and he who insists on order and regularity, and, without caprice, enforces obedience, is sure of their respect. They have no respect for a man who does not *claim* respect as his due; they cannot submit willingly and regularly to one who does not insist on obedience and regularity himself. It is too much to expect a large number of boys or men to keep *themselves* in order, without some actual, visible, external restraint. And this both men and boys like. They actually enjoy more liberty by being so restrained: they are more comfortable for being kept in a state

of high discipline. 'Legum,' says Cicero,\* 'idcirco omnes servi sumus, ut liberi esse possimus.'

We have said much against the sciences supplanting the classics, or even interfering with their high claims in education. It may be asked then, Would you give a boy no scientific knowledge? Would you have him leave school without any information on the most important and interesting facts in science or any general knowledge? We reply, by no means. Those most important facts can be communicated in a very short time, and as the pupil is become versed in arithmetic (which we have all along supposed), if not also in the mathematics, he will have no difficulty in following out any of the sciences to which his future destination may lead him, seeing that by his classical studies he has acquired a *power*, which, being applicable to any object, will enable him to make progress in chemistry as well as in history, if he chooses to devote himself to that study. And as to general knowledge; we conceive that a well-stocked library, containing books of entertainment and instruction of various kinds and on various subjects, is the best teacher. The pupil can there suit his own taste, and if he is fond of natural history, he can and will choose Buffon, or some other books which treat of it; if he prefers biography, he will choose the life of Nelson, of Cortez, of Wellington, or some other favorite hero, perhaps even the volumes of the veracious Plutarch; if he leans to natural philosophy, he will choose books relating to that subject; and if he has a taste for anecdotes, the Percy anecdotes, and such-like volumes are at his command. By such voluntary and unshackled indulgence of particular taste and propension within given limits, a boy's mind will develop in the most natural manner.

There are many other points on which we should have wished to touch; such as the proportions and kinds of liberty which should be allowed, and of restraint which should be exercised in schools, the most efficacious kinds of rewards and punishments, the hours of study, the amount of actual instruction which should be given, and the amount of solitary independent preparation which should be required; the effect of lectures, and so forth, on all which subjects there is much popular misconception: but the length to which this paper has already extended, warns us to conclude. We cannot finish, however, without again adverting to the increased and increasing number of works on the subject of education. Books on education have multiplied within the last few years beyond all precedent. We cannot say that we think people have acquired juster notions on the subject, or have made any material progress in consequence of these productions.

---

\* Pro A. Cluentio, § 53.



They have, as we have before said, and it cannot be too often repeated, they have been written chiefly, almost entirely, by *unpractical* men, and we may add, *women*. They have been written by theorizers, who have seen evils, and *thought* they saw how to remedy them, and they might have remedied them, and so could any one else, if a few strokes of the pen would do it. But this is not the case. Children have wills; and they cannot be worked quite in a mechanical way like a steam engine. No antecedently formed plan can provide for emergencies which may arise, and may arise every day; no antecedent study or thought can anticipate the difficulties which occur, or the means of meeting them. A plan which sounds well to the ear, and looks well on paper, and seems plausible and feasible to one who is not a teacher, will often to a man of ten years' experience in teaching, be *obviously* unmanageable and absurd. The framer of the plan did not *know* the material he had to work on, or the way of working upon it. The practical schoolmaster, like a skilful lawyer, knows what boys are, and what they are *in numbers*, and what effect any given plan will be likely to have on them; and when any new plan is proposed, he falls back on his precedents, and applies his knowledge of the past to any proposal for the future. A new theory or speculation will not deceive him. Theorizers are liable to be deceived at every step. Results which they *fancy* will follow a given course, the practical schoolmaster often *knows* will *not* follow. Experience is the safe guide. We cannot, then, but express our regret that the educational treatises and manuals with which the public has lately been inundated, have not been written by practical men, men of experience in that on which they offer to instruct others.

We want no more treatises on teaching from writers who have never taught; no more plans of education from persons who have never educated; no more schemes of discipline from those who have never exercised discipline themselves. The opinion of one practical schoolmaster is worth more than that of a hundred theorizers.

Art. II. *Moral Views of Commerce, Society, and Politics ; in Twelve Discourses.* By the Rev. ORVILLE DEWEY. 12mo. Fox, Paternoster Row.

THRICE honored be the man of whatever country, creed, or party, who should prevail to introduce and give efficiency to another and a purer morality than that which at present presides over, or rather leaves lawless, both the commerce and the politics of Christendom—and surely above all parallel or precedent, the politics of our own country. The curse of selfishness—of blind, grasping covetousness, ravenous for gain, vigorously and intensely set to its purpose, is indeed but too odiously visible in many of the transactions of commerce. Yet this is a dull and innocuous demon in comparison with the fierce and reckless fiend that has taken upon him to rule the region of politics, and to whom his votaries seem to have conceded by acclamation, not only an unlimited, but an utterly reckless domination. The god of their idolatry is a most perfect and consummate *diabolus*, accomplished in every art of satanic policy, and equipped with every weapon of the infernal armory. Yet, strange to tell, he is transformed into an angel of light, invokes the name of Christ, sprinkles himself with holy water, and claims both the sanction and protection of the cross.

Moderate men and pious men are weeping in secret places, and sighing in spirit, for the abominations that are perpetrated at noon-day, but no one appears to lift up a standard for outraged truth, and forgotten justice, and banished honor. The press has become a bottomless pit, pouring forth its daily, weekly, monthly, and quarterly volumes of fire and brimstone, which not only out-top and overpower all the barriers of morality, but threaten to convulse and devastate society to its lowest foundations. The very pulpits of the land are now becoming usurped by this political demon, from whence he is hurling firebrands, arrows, and death, in all directions and at high places.

In defiance of decency, truth, and conscience, our would-be dictators, and *soi-disant* expositors of public opinion, are at the present moment insulting humanity, belying patriotism, and trampling christianity under their iron hoofs. The men who ought, from their office, and their profession, to be foremost in quelling the spirit of party, and enforcing the claims of candor, truth, and justice, whose very names and countenances, in places of assembly and concourse, should prove like oil upon the troubled waters, or as old Nestor's eloquence upon the infuriated hosts of the Greeks, are possessed by that rabid demon of party politics, which, like the man among the tombs, snaps asunder all chains, and despite the alleged apostolicity of the whole bench

of bishops, defies the twelve apostles themselves, to cast him out; unless indeed they were at once to disown the entire succession, because of the spirit which animates it—a circumstance which many might think not at all improbable, considering that they have cautioned us against *false apostles*, and affirmed that, ‘if any man have not the spirit of Christ, he is none of his.’

It seems, however, utterly hopeless to remind the whole party, lay and clerical, of any pledges they have given, or of any professions by which they are bound. To tell them of the gentle spirit of their divine Saviour, or of the refined and impartial laws of his religion—to allege your rights as men, your feelings as christians, or your liberties as British subjects, it is like preaching to the winds, or reasoning with madness.

The times in which we live, present a large class foremost in politics, and foremost in the church, whom no force of reasoning can convince, and no pleas of equity or humanity can move. *Self—us—and our*, are the words that limit all that is great, good, or precious. These fill that narrow circle to which all their ideas and all their sympathies are restricted. Beyond that circle no persuasion, no argument, can by any possibility induce them to look. This is their centre and their circumference. Every thing is there. Out of it there is nothing interesting, nothing worth a thought. This is their infinity. The rancor of their spirit outstrips all parallel—the dishonesty and unfairness of their proceedings mock all morality, and laugh at conscience. Whatever may be said, and said perhaps but too justly, of the recklessness of speculation, the want of honor and good faith in business, yet the exchange and the market are virtuous and moral, we had almost said immaculate, when compared with the different arenas of political contention, and even the platforms of some of our public societies. Religion is profaned, literature is disgraced, science is defiled, social life is embittered and become exclusive or *clanish*. The spirit of a Bradshaw may be taken as the personification of a host of laymen, while the bigoted and reckless ravings of a Close, a M’Neil, and a Gathercole, are rousing the clergy in all directions. The pulpit is rivalling the daily press in ebullitions of political rancor and treasonable insolence. We have heard of an instance of a clergyman in one of our populous cities, who has passed beyond all competitors in a fifth of November sermon, and *out-Bradshawed* Bradshaw himself.

If the infuriated party had any conscience or any shame, should we after this ever hear again of political dissenters? Will the *Record* hereafter have the effrontery to upbraid dissenters with the sin of interfering in politics, when its own cherished party have rushed forward into the fiercest and thickest of the onslaught? The hypocrisy of the hue and cry against political dissenters is amply demonstrated by the gratulations with which



a dissenter is always hailed when his politics are of the right sort, and the zest with which the political speeches of the evangelical clergy are recorded and read. The unpardonable sin of the dissenters, in the eyes of such parties, is not that they are political at all, but that their politics are on the wrong side; for these gentlemen have obviously no antipathy to politics, as such, but only to every body's politics except their own. '*Orthodoxy*,' said Franklin, 'means your own *doxy*; heterodoxy is any other man's *doxy*.' True, O Franklin, thy definition hits the case. It is not that all *politics* are sinful, nor the degree to which they are pushed, abstractedly considered, but the *heterodoxy* of them is the sin. Political dissenters would be as much commended and petted as political churchmen, did they but symbolize with the right party. But because they do not and cannot sacrifice their consciences, write them down, talk them down, vote them down, beat them down, and trample them down—all shall be fair, moral, and evangelical, so that they may but be *down*, and kept down, and ourselves kept up. This is the kind of morality, not only of the newspaper editors, but, alas, of our clergy, evangelical and anti-evangelical, to an extent that scarcely admits of exception.

What is to be the issue of all this? Will it subserve the cause of truth, religion, and national virtue? Will it convince opponents and make them friends? Is it not rather calculated to dishonor christianity and dissolve the bonds of all moral and social order? It is with deep grief we daily witness the excesses of party spirit—the direct immorality which is practised in controversy, and the palpable trifling with the interests of truth, honor, and candor, which disgraces not merely the newspapers, but our literature, and to a great extent our theology. It is scarcely to be believed but that many of our party scribes must be perfectly conscious of all this violence and villany, however fair they may deem it, to render an opponent or an opposite party odious and hateful, to present them belabored or bespattered by mere Billingsgate, for the amusement or triumph of their own friends. Yet all this is unquestionably base in principle, disgusting in practice, and injurious to the morals of society.

It is indeed high time that some honorable and right-feeling men, of all parties, should step forward to remind the belligerents that they are human and rational; and that at all events, if they must and will contend, there are laws of honorable war, to which all civilized nations have acceded, and which none would disregard but savages and cannibals. It might befit the infidel bloodhounds of the first French revolution to rave round the Tuilleries like tigers and wolves with the palpitating limbs of their victims in their mouths; but does it behove christian men and

Englishmen to emulate the rage of beasts and the violence of maniacs? When rational beings feel that they must inevitably differ in opinion upon subjects of high importance and interest, surely they are mutually bound to lessen the inconvenience and unhappiness of such difference by all the means in their power. It is evil enough to be conscientiously compelled to disagree, without adding to this the rancor of enmity, and breaking up society into hostile bands intent upon nothing but mutual destruction. It is indeed a pestilent evil which has grown upon us in the heat of party strifes, to count every man that differs from us an enemy; and it is still worse to push this feeling out into all the relations of life, and all the business and intercourse of society—to scruple no means of effecting the disgrace and ruin of an adversary.

In the name of humanity, of truth, and candor, and our common religion, we reclaim against this diabolical spirit which is openly stalking forth and transforming men into furies, gladiators, assassins—habituating them to every thing that is base, false, and violent; openly shouting *war to the knife!* and proclaiming the lawfulness of all means for the good of our church, and the suppression of dissenters and liberals. Surely there is patriotism, morality, and moderation enough among us, to rebuke this foul spirit and chain this Leviathan. Let the men of candor, justice, and conscience, protest against all this violence, and frown at these fiery zealots as the men of Canterbury have done. Let the intolerable insolence of the state-clergy be condemned by their parishioners; and let the sacredness of the pulpit be defended by the people, when it is desecrated by the clergy, or let them leave the mock thunderers to launch their bolts in empty space. If peace is dearer to us than the cause of factions, and the interests of truth, virtue, and religion above those of party and of politics, then let all honest, and christian, and candid men join to decry and condemn the virulence, and violence, and disloyalty which are fast hastening on a crisis of the most alarming kind. Happy indeed would it be for the country if a respite could be obtained—a breathing time allowed when each might consider to what all this immorality will ultimately tend, if unchecked and unreprieved. Violence on the one side will undoubtedly provoke violence on the other. The tories and the churchmen may foster and encourage the outrages of the physical force men against the liberals and the middle classes; but can they imagine that they would themselves be safe in the event of a chartist rebellion? Or that the men who say that the whigs are beating them with rods, would in the event of throwing off the yoke, hug those who have always chastised them with scorpions? How insane then is the policy which is at the present moment exacerbating all the feelings of hostile parties; and instead of aiming to

uphold morality and social order, is setting an example of outrageous insolence, immorality, disloyalty, and sedition to that rude and ignorant class which is known to be extensively organized and ripe for rebellion. Has not all this violence in the lower orders been stimulated, fostered, and called forth, by the example of their betters; and is it not at the present moment in danger of being imitated by those betters? Would it not be at once imitated by them on behalf of their Hanoverian Orangeman, if the favorable moment should occur, and if they could but persuade themselves that they had as strong a physical force to work with, as the unhappy and deluded chartists supposed they had? It is evident that there are clergymen who would not hesitate to rival Stephens, yea, ten to one, who would be zealous to sanctify the rebellion with prayers, in the name of the apostolical succession; and laymen, like Bradshaw, or even peers that must be nameless, who would rush from their castles or their club houses, to rival Frost or Lovett on the mountains of Wales.

The little unpretending volume before us has suggested to us the propriety of repeating the protest against party violence and rancor, which we have on former occasions not hesitated to put forth. Glad indeed should we be to find that our example had been imitated by other and more influential caterers for the reading and thinking public. We cannot but believe that the republication of this work in England, may be eminently serviceable at the present time, if men of all parties will but read it, and if perchance they retain any respect for the name of Christian by which they are designated.

The volume, indeed, discloses to us one fact of which, we confess, we were not fully aware; that the state of feeling in America, though of course depending on very different questions, singularly and lamentably harmonizes with that of the mother country. So much so, that if the references to particular facts and circumstances had been omitted, and America had not been mentioned, we should have received the work as eminently adapted to our own case. Take, for instance, the following as applicable to the state of political morality in America. Nothing could be written more appropriate to our own country at the present moment.

‘There is also a theory of opposition to the government, the *beau ideal* of an opposition man, which, it were to be wished, were more considered than it is. To pull down and destroy, is not, in ordinary circumstances, the legitimate end of an opposition; but it is to limit, to control, to correct, and thus ultimately to assist. It is not to look upon the government as a hostile power, that has made a lodgment in the country, and is to be expelled by a party war, but as a lawfully constituted power, that is to be watched, restrained, and kept from



going wrong. Still, it is the government of our country, and is to be respected. Still, it is the government of our country, and is to be regarded with a candid, and I had almost said, a filial spirit. Its officers are not to be assailed with scurrilous abuse, nor its departments to be degraded by vile epithets. There is a certain consideration and dignity to be preserved by an opposition; if not—if its spirit is altogether factious and fault-finding; if it rejoices over the errors of an administration, it so far loses all respectability; it shows that it is not so anxious for good government, as to be itself the government.

‘Oppositions, then, parties, party arguments and measures, all have their legitimate sphere. But now, I say, in the second place, that when they transcend their sphere, when they overleap the bounds of morality, they become engines of evil and peril to the country.

‘The only sound and safe principle, I must continually insist, is that which binds morals and politics, in indissoluble union; which admits of no compromise, exception, or question; which will hear of nothing as expedient that is at variance with truth and justice. Politics are to have no scale of morality, graduated to their exigencies. That which is wrong everywhere else, is wrong here; that which is wrong for every other body of men, is wrong for a party. A bad man in every other relation, is a bad man for the country; he may, indeed, chance to espouse some right measure, but he who is devoid of all principles in private life, can give no satisfactory pledge that he will be governed by any principle in public life.

‘The evils of forsaking the moral guidance in political affairs, are various and vast, and they demand the most serious consideration; they more deeply concern the country than any peril to its visible prosperity; they are such, that they demand our most solemn meditation in our holiest hours and places.

‘The tendency of political action, when set free from moral restraint, is to break down all personal independence in the country. Parties, then, demand, not honesty, but service of their votaries. Governments strengthen themselves by bribery and corruption. Oppositions take the same arms, and in their hour of success retort the same measures. Abuses become precedents, and precedents multiply abuses. Every new administration, every generation of politicians, becomes not wiser but worse than their predecessors, their fathers. The tendency of things, without moral restraint, is ever downwards. Already have we arrived at that stage of deterioration, when you will find many respectable and honest men in the country, blinded by reasonings like these; ‘why should not an administration,’ they say, ‘reward its friends and supporters? What is it, but righting the wrongs done by a previous administration? What is it, in fact, but choosing its friends rather than its enemies, to help it carry on the government?’ I will grant that this must be done in regard to its immediate council, its cabinet. But when it extends beyond this to subordinate officers, what is it but a system of favoritism and proscription, fatal to all public virtue? Honesty then becomes a discarded and persecuted virtue; and mere blind, unscrupulous, party zeal, becomes the only passport to honors and emoluments. Honorable citizenship is sunk in base partizanship. The entire

natural dignity, so far as it is connected with its political action, freedom, franchise, patriotism, self-respect—all is merged in a vile scramble for office. The national conscience is sold in the market; the national honor is all bowed down to the worship of interest; the corrupted nation sets up a golden calf in place of the divinity of pristine and holy truth; and not the Israelites at the footstool of God's manifested presence were more debased and sacrilegious idolaters. The destruction of mutual confidence and respect, is another evil connected with our party strifes, and to me it is one of the most painful.

‘Pass through the different party circles of the country, and what shall you hear? In the course of a single day you shall hear every public man in the country charged with a total want of principle; you shall hear this constantly from men of the greatest sobriety and weight of character. Not one man in public life, high enough to be a mark for observation, shall escape this tremendous proscription. If you open the newspapers, in the hope by some patient reading and investigation, to ascertain what the truth is, you find yourself immediately launched upon a sea of doubts. Every fact, every measure, every man, is represented in such different lights, that you are totally at a loss, so far as that testimony goes, what to believe. You are in a worse condition than a juror, vexed by contrary pleadings; you have no judge to help you, and the whole country is filled with party pleadings, without law or precedent, without rule or restraint. You soon come to feel as if nothing less than the devotion of a whole life can enable you thoroughly to understand the questions that are brought before you; but you have no life to give; you have something else to do. There is, indeed, one way to find relief; and it is the common way. It is to believe every thing that one party says, and nothing that another says; but he must altogether abjure his reason, who believes that this is the way to come at the truth. And yet this is the course usually adopted, and men are reading their favourite journals the year round, not to get their minds enlightened and their judgments corrected, but only to have their passions inflamed and their prejudices confirmed.

‘Thus the grand instrument of public opinion is broken. Sound and virtuous public opinion is the only safeguard of the country; and yet men lay their hands upon it as recklessly as if it were given them to practice upon, and to pervert and poison at their pleasure; as if this great surrounding atmosphere of thought, which invests and sustains the people, were but a laboratory for the experiments of ingenuity and tricks of legerdemain.

‘Then, I, say confidence is fallen, and with it is fallen mutual respect. What respect can there be between parties who are constantly accusing one another of fraud and perjury, of the worst practices, and the basest ends? What respect between editors of journals, who are daily charging each other with intrigue, malignity, and wilful falsehood? Can any honorable mind desire this state of things? Can nothing be done to introduce a new morality, a new courtesy into our discussions? Must our conflicts always be of this bad and brutal character? Is it not the inevitable tendency of this fierce and blasting recrimina-

tion to blunt the sense of honor ! Instead of feeling 'a stain like a wound,' a man is likely to come out of such conflicts, scared and scaled all over as with the mail of Leviathan. I confess that I look with more respect upon the gentle courtesy of the old chivalry, upon the mad sense of honor defended in the tournament, upon the bloody battling of natural pride and jealousy, than upon the abusive and outrageous language of our party strifes. All this too in a time of peace ! All this for difference of opinion on grave and difficult questions, upon which men may lawfully and honestly differ ! Opponents for such cause treating one another like ruffians ! Reputation, the life—the more than life—of a man, stabbed and slain in the shambles of this political butchery ! Tell us not, men of the world ! of our *religious disputes* ! Talk not of our *odium theologicum*. Say nothing of the contentions of professional men, or of the quarrels of authors. Their sound is scarcely heard now, nor is it likely any more to be audible in this land ; for it is all lost in the loud strife and fierce battle of politics that is every year and every month rising and raging around us.'

—pp. 273—278.

These views are eminently just and wise, worthy of the attention of civilized nations, and of our own country in particular. The perusal of them at the present time, both by citizens and legislators, would tend greatly to restrain that violence and dishonesty which are the disgrace of political proceedings both in the Forum and out of it. One most influential means of spreading the rancor of party is the press, and preeminently the periodical press ; and since all parties, and eminent men of all parties, are constantly made the victims of unprincipled calumny, and as Mr. Dewey terms it, of *political butchery*, it is to the interest of all parties, and of all men in public life, to enforce in every direction the necessity of a thorough moral reform in the language of social controversy. If the editors of the periodical press have not conscience enough, have not reverence enough for truth, have not respect enough for themselves, to curb their licentious pens, and abjure the vocabulary of Billingsgate, then let the readers of their own party, effectually intimate to them, in a way that cannot be misunderstood, how deeply public morals are injured, the laws of civilized intercourse outraged, and above all, the interests of truth and religion sacrificed by that hateful and baneful kind of writing, whose only varieties from column to column lie between vulgar bullying and eloquent blackguardism. We heartily thank Mr. Dewey for the manly and rational stand he has made against these unprincipled and pestilent violations of truth, decency, and morality.

The following passage is worthy of becoming a standing motto for all political and literary journalists, and of being committed to memory by every member of the imperial parliament.



‘ Personal independence beaten down ; mutual confidence and respect prostrated ; moral deterioration follows as a natural consequence. I do not forget to limit the observation. I know that political action is not the whole action of the country. I do not say that the national character is sunk to the point of its political derelictions ; by no means ; but this I say, that in morality, in politics, so far as it can take effect, tends to debase and brutalize the country ; it tends to corrupt the public sentiment, and to degrade private virtue. No man is so pure, but he is vilified without mercy by the opposite party ; no man is so base, so vicious, so criminal, but he is sustained without conscience by his own. It tends to divest the franchise of all dignity, and the government of all venerableness. Let politics be separated from principle, from a high and commanding morality, and, instead of a free people at the polls, we shall have the brawls of a vulgar election ; and instead of a magnanimous and self-poised government, we shall have a miserable, time-serving, place-keeping function. . . . It is but for every writer and speaker in the country to charge himself to speak and write with fairness, candor, and courtesy ; for every citizen to vote honestly ; for every legislator and ruler to act as one who has sworn at the altar of truth, in the sight of heaven. Oh, come, holy truth, easier than falsehood ! primeval virtue, better than victory ! and that which the sages of the world, the prophets of human hope, looking over the ages, have sighed to behold—shall appear—a free and happy community—a free, lofty, and self-governed people !’—p. 279.

It is not at all unlikely, if this volume should fall into the hands of some of our literary craftsmen, that they will endeavour to make sport with it, and probably set it as the Philistines did Sampson, between the columns of their idol’s temple, that they may mock him. But let them take heed. It will be easy, perfectly so, to malign it, because it is American ; and just as easy to hate it, because it pleads for honor and morality. It will suit the interests of those who live by outrage and falsehood to decry and condemn what they cannot gainsay. Who ever knew a thief that liked a halter, or a guilty culprit that did not hate the law ? We should rejoice to be able for once to exercise a little arbitrary power, and shut up every political scribe from the mighty thunderer of Printing-house square, to the little dirty squibber of the Ten Towns Messenger, in their back parlours, or suburban villas, or smoky garrets, till they had read carefully through the whole of these admirable discourses ; and if many of them, when the task was over, did not come forth with a blush of crimson upon their cheeks, the world would have a just right to say it was because they had long since sold their conscience for filthy lucre, or because they had the hearts of tigers and not of men, or because the only one they ever had was turned to cinder by their inveterate habit of forging within it nothing but thunderbolts.

We have not space to quote from those parts of the work

which relate to commerce and social intercourse, war, education, and liberty. There is, however, much in the author's discourses upon all these subjects, that is worthy of public attention, and which can scarcely be read by any man, or christians of any party, without advantage. To the men of business, who are not men of a political bias, the work will prove as instructive and useful as to any. There is a tone of manly dignity, of calmness, and discrimination, preserved throughout all the discussions. There are a few expressions, and but a few, that would induce us to suspect that the author is not of our own views in theology. But while this difference is scarcely discernible in his pages, the suspicion of it has made us the more anxious to read candidly, to judge impartially, and to commend warmly and honestly. We have found much to approve, much that at the present moment deserves to be read extensively, and little that requires stricture.

There is one point, however, on which we differ from the author. We question much whether his work would not altogether have been more successful and acceptable if it had not assumed the form of pulpit discourses. We are not convinced by what he has said of the propriety of preaching whole sermons, and especially a course of sermons, on these topics, though they are confessedly important and connected with the morals of christianity. We will not, however, press this allegation against him, when we remember how much pleasure we have derived from his labors, and reflect that, not improbably, this was the best use he could make both of his talents and his pulpit, as he himself seems to think. We are content; and heartily wish his work as extensive a circulation as himself can expect, or his English publishers in his stead.

---

Art. III. *A Diary in America, with Remarks on its Institutions.*  
*Part Second.* By CAPTAIN MARRYAT, C.B. In 3 vols. London:  
Longman. 1839.

THE new world appears to be affording ample matter for speculation to the inhabitants of the old; and like the camelion in the fable, is represented as blue, green, black, or white, according to the point of view in which its visitors behold it. It is the stage on which a great drama is performing; the result of which will be an example, or a beacon to the whole civilized world. Many are the opinions, and of course the contradictions, which have been put forth concerning it, to no one of which can implicit faith be given, because at present they are and must be,

matters of conjecture. The problem is yet to be solved; not as in mathematics, where the use of given and unalterable quantities must produce a certain result; but as one which is open to the influence of new and collateral agents, some of which may yet have to appear, while the full influence of others already in existence, can scarcely be appreciated or foreseen. To each succeeding traveller, events appear to have that tendency, which his previous opinions would lead him to infer; and the extent of his wishes is often the boundary of his opinions. Every thing is seen in his favorite light; and as soon as his prepossessions are discovered, it is not difficult for an ingenious and somewhat malicious people, to lead him widely astray, while they persuade him that his path is direct and plain. If we receive as truth one half of the information which our successive authors communicate, we may probably be near the mark; the misfortune is, that, as Dr. Johnson remarked on a somewhat similar occasion, 'we do not know *which* half' to take. One principal defect in the ratiocination of many of our writers on America is this, that they leave entirely out of their calculations, the probable effects of the great moral and *religious* causes which are evidently at work, and which must exert an ever increasing influence on the destinies of our brethren of the West.

Of these the author before us appears to understand nothing, and therefore wisely says but little; and even that little had been as well unsaid. Of strong Church and Tory prejudices, he admits more candidly than prudently, the object of his work; and that every individual anecdote and observation was written with a certain motive: which admission, however, would probably never have been made but for the strictures of the Edinburgh Review.

The work, in fact, is constructed on the most approved model of the *elephant trap*: commencing with apparently sufficient latitude, and ornamented with anecdotes and observations with nothing of a startling nature in them, yet with a latent bearing, and placed there with the (afterwards) avowed purpose of alluring those whom graver demonstrations might alarm; and we are half led half coaxed by our guide, through a succession of discussions, all narrowing and closing in to his purpose by degrees, till we are landed safely, as he thinks, in a perfect Tory trap; where our conductor unwinds his trunk from our necks, turns round upon us, and *salaams*, with 'pretty considerable' coolness and self-complacency.

This is scarcely fair; but the object is thus stated. 'Those who would not look at a more serious work will read this; and the opinions it contains will be widely disseminated and impressed, *without the reader's being aware of it*;' that it may be read, 'not merely by the highly educated portion of the commu-



'nity, for they are able to judge for themselves, but by every tradesman and mechanic, pored over by milliners' girls and boys behind the counter, and thumbed to pieces in every petty circulating library' (the italics in the two first sentences are ours). Vol. iii. pp. 292, 293.

Those who cannot judge for themselves are certainly the most likely to be proselyted by the work; but what adequate end can be answered by trepanning boys from the counter, or milliners' girls, we do not exactly see. In America, where, according to the author, the majority are all-powerful, it might do something; but in these kingdoms, where matters are differently conducted, the conversion of the whole sisterhood of milliners would probably end in some such harmless demonstration, as the construction of Winchelsea tuckers, or Roden bonnets.

We, too, as well as Captain M., have heard the work denounced as 'light,' filled with mere anecdotes, &c.; there is enough of graver matter, however, in these last volumes; nor do we quite agree with these denunciations. In our opinion, nothing can be called *light* (in the sense of frivolous) that illustrates habits, manners, or modes of thinking; and we fear the *lightness* is often less in the subject matter than in the mind of the reader himself: which has not strength enough to elicit a truth when it is not opened and laid before him; nor judgment enough to appreciate a moral, unless it is presented in a regular didactic form, and superscribed 'important.'

Two objects appear to be aimed at throughout the work—'to do serious injury to the cause of democracy,' and 'to assist the cause of conservatism.\*' With the first we do not quarrel, for we are no democrats; to the second we decidedly demur, for we are no Tories. To any attempt to injure the cause of democracy we might have been indifferent, had it been fairly made; but when, in addition to what we conceive to be unfairness on the one hand, an attempt is made on the other, to throw the demerits of democracy as merits into the scale of Toryism, we must oppose our protest, at least until it can be proved, that the one is good because the other is bad, or, which amounts to much the same thing, that the opposite of wrong is right.

By way of injuring the cause of democracy, the author asserts first, that the Americans are the least moral of all nations; and, secondly, that their want of morality is to be attributed to the nature of their institutions.

'I consider that at this present time the standard of morality is lower in America than in any other portion of the civilized globe. I

---

\* Vol. ii. p. 256, and vol. iii. p. 293.

say at this present time, for it was not so even twenty years ago, and possibly may not be so twenty years hence. There is a change constantly going on, in every thing below, and I believe, for many reasons, that a change for the better will soon take place in America. There are even now many thousands of virtuous, honorable, and enlightened people in the United States ; but at present virtue is passive, while vice is active.

‘I have observed in my preface, that the virtues and vices of a nation are to be traced to a form of government, the climate, and circumstances ; and it will be easy to show that to the above may be ascribed much of the merit as well as the demerits of the people of the United States. In the first place, I consider the example set by the government as most injurious ; as I shall hereafter prove, it is insatiable in its ambition, regardless of its faith, and corrupt to the highest degree. This example I consider as the first cause of the demoralization of the Americans. The errors incident to the voluntary system of religion are the second : the power of the clergy is destroyed, and the tyranny of the laity has produced the effect of the outward form having been substituted for the real feeling, and hypocrisy has been but too often substituted for religion.

‘To the evil of bad example from the government is superadded the natural tendency of a democratic form of government to excite ambition without having the power to gratify it morally or virtuously ; and the debasing influence of the pursuit of gain is everywhere apparent. It shows itself in the fact that money is in America every thing, and every thing else nothing.’—Vol. ii. pp. 142—144.

A recklessness and indifference to the loss of human life is one of the immoralities for which it seems that the institutions of the Americans have to answer. This is attributed to the eager pursuit of gain, which renders them indifferent to the furious speed of their coaches and steam carriages, the want of sea-worthiness in their vessels, and the danger from fires and explosions in the racing of their steam-boats on the rivers. But do these things happen in America only ? Are there no steam-boats on our waters, loaded almost to sinking on our holidays for the sake of gain ? No collisions on the Thames ? No bursting of boilers on the Clyde ? How often have Mercator and Scrutator assured us in our daily papers, that the disproportionate loss of life in our merchant service, arises from the circumstance that our ships are not sea-worthy ? Our cargoes and our vessels say they are insured to the full value at Lloyd's (often we believe above it), and as to the men, n'importe, *they* are no loss—at least to the owners.

The only difference in the two cases appears to be, that in America the government is taking severe measures to check the evil, while no government in this country, so far as we know, has ever troubled itself on the subject. So that democracy appears to us to have the advantage here, at least.

The thirst of gain it seems has also produced a spirit of false-

hood and dishonesty, which has thoroughly corrupted the morals of the people. This, however, cannot apply to *all* the people, for 'there are even now thousands of virtuous, honorable, and 'enlightened people in the United States.'—vol. ii. p. 143. Nor can it, moreover, apply to the whole trading community even; for—'The New York merchants are, as a body, highly honorable men.'—p. 149.

We suppose, then, it must be applicable only to the lower grades among traders. At p. 152, vol. ii. we read,

'Trade demoralizes; there are so many petty arts and frauds necessary to be resorted to by every class in trade, to enable them to compete with each other; so many lies told, as a matter of business, to tempt a purchaser, that almost insensibly and by degrees the shopkeeper becomes dishonest. These demoralizing practices must be resorted to, even by those who would fain avoid them, or they have no chance of competing with their rivals in business. It is not the honest tradesman who makes a rapid fortune; indeed, it is doubtful whether he could carry on his business; and yet, from assuetude and not being taxed with dishonesty, the shopkeeper scarcely ever feels that he is dishonest. Now, this is the worst state of demoralization, where you are blind to your errors, and conscience is never awakened, and in this state may be considered, with few exceptions, every class of traders, whether in *England, America, or elsewhere*.'

Now, as the vices of a nation are the consequences of its institutions; and recklessness of life, falsehood, and dishonesty, in certain classes in America, are owing to democracy, and the voluntary principle; it follows of course that the same vices in the same classes in *this* country, must be owing to a monarchical form of government, and an established church.

But *all* the immorality in the United States is not owing to the spirit of gain; a great part of it is attributed to *the want of an aristocracy*. Here some indications of the trap are apparent; and, as regards our own country, we learn for the first time, that the high tone of morality and *religion* among us is owing to the *aristocracy*! 'An aristocracy is as necessary for the morals as 'for the government of a nation.' 'There being more morality 'among the *lower* class than in the middling, and still more in the 'higher than in the lower' (!)—vol. ii. p. 151. Moreover, 'It has 'been acknowledged by other nations, and I believe it to be true, 'that the nobility and gentry of England are the most moral, most 'religious, and most honorable classes that can be found, not only 'in our country, but in any other country in the world, and such 'they certainly ought from *circumstances* to be.'—p. 155.

We deny the position altogether; extremes meet, and those who are 'from circumstances' either above or below the necessity of observing the stricter decencies of society, will always be 'from



'circumstances' less moral than those who are under the necessity of respecting them.

Again, M. De Tocqueville (of quotations from whom, by the bye, a good part of this second volume is made up) opineth, that 'In aristocratic governments the individuals who are placed at the head of affairs are rich men, who are solely desirous of power. In democracies statesmen are poor, and they have their fortunes to make. The consequence is, that in aristocratic states the rulers are rarely accessible to corruption, and have very little craving for money; whilst the reverse is the case in democratic nations.'—vol. ii. p. 158. 'This,' says our author, 'is true.' We say it is not true. M. De Tocqueville is a Frenchman, and he has dared to write and print this, with the recorded history of the whole French aristocracy before him; from the time of Henri Quatre, to that of Louis the Sixteenth inclusive; and a prouder, meaner, baser, and more profligate order never disgraced a nation. 'Rarely accessible to corruption,' indeed! they were corruption itself; 'little craving for money!' why they would accept of fifty louis d'ors from a king, a financier, or a king's concubine; and crawled from profligacy to vice, and from vice to villany, till the nation rose, and crushed them! We fancy M. De Tocqueville, also, has a taste for 'assisting conservatism' by doing serious injury to democracy.

As regards our own country, no part of M. De Tocqueville's statement is a matter of course. It is not a thing of necessity here that a plebeian statesman should be poor, or a noble statesman rich; and there are more means of corruption than putting money in one's hand. A poor nobleman might refuse a thousand pounds, and accept a place; or a rich one might *possibly* desire to leave his fortune to his eldest son, and allow the country the honor of providing for all the younger ones. The chairman at a late public dinner, a captain in the navy (and, therefore, *of course*, a good authority for any thing), is reported to have said, that in his time, and in his profession, no man had even a chance of rising, unless he were the son of a lord, a Tory, or, we believe he added, a Scotchman; if he were referring to Lord Melville's time, no doubt he did. Could corruption be carried to a greater height than this, in any democracy on earth?

The mention of this last named personage reminds us of a charge which is somewhat violently urged against America, viz., that in that country a public defaulter escapes unpunished; on which we make no further comment.

We now recur to the assertion, that in this country 'there is more morality among the lower class than in the middling, and still more in the higher than in the lower;' and shall endeavor to point out the fallacies by which it is attempted—for the effort is made—to justify it. A more complete piece of Tory Jesuitism

and mystification we have seldom seen. Here the trap narrows considerably.

In order to prove the low state of morality in the middling class, the author fixes on the trading part of the community—the shopkeepers; and instances the dishonesty contracted by their pursuits. Can any thing be more unfair than to select *this part* of the middle classes as a proper representative of the whole? Where are all our merchants, and rich manufacturers; where our thousands of professional, and literary, and scientific men? Where our second and third rate gentlemen, living on moderate certain incomes; where our *retired* tradesmen, who have left their temptations behind them? The matter is, that the intelligent middle classes are precisely those who are most opposed to corruption in church and state; and those, moreover, which include a great majority of the Dissenters. The object, therefore, is to lower them in the eyes of the public by invidious comparisons, or any other means.

But the lower classes are more moral than the middle; that is some comfort: but how is it proved? By setting aside all the numerous manufacturing bodies, and, indeed, every other, except the *agricultural* class, and instancing them as the representatives of the lower orders. That is, the very class who are entirely, 'from circumstances,' not from choice, under the complete control of the Tory landowners; and obliged to do their little all to support them. And the taking of these men, assumed to be the *best* of *their* order, and pitting them against the shopkeepers, assumed to be the *worst* of theirs, is intended, we suppose, for fair comparison. Our readers see at once, that the exaltation of this fraction of a class, at the expense of the other and differently disposed parts of it, and of the whole of the middle orders, is saying one word for the men, and two for Toryism.

But, oh, for a forty-tory power to sound the praises of the aristocracy! It is acknowledged by other nations (and also by Captain Marryat), that the nobility and gentry of England are the most *moral*, most *religious*, and most honorable classes, not only in our country, but in every other country in the world! The nature of their morals every body knows,—we are speaking of the aristocracy—but their *religion*! They are high Churchmen and Tories, and with not more, we believe, than about half a dozen *known* exceptions, belong to that class of men who are opposed not only to Dissenters and the voluntary system—that would be a trifle in comparison—but to evangelical religion; the religion, that is, of the evangelists, of the New Testament, in short. It cannot then be the religion of the New Testament, with which they are chargeable. Nevertheless they *are* religious in our author's sense. Every one who reads the Quarterly, and other journals of the same party, must know well, that the reli-

gion of which they are so fond of talking, is mere Church of Englandism, of *real* religion they know no more than a political pamphleteering bishop. But the aristocracy are supporters of the Church as by law—not religion—established; how else could younger sons be provided for? And how could they themselves be provided with ministers with whom their 'order' could associate, if it were not for a Church which deals in worldly wealth and honors? They *are*, then, *religious*; and we suppose Lord Winchelsea, who has declared, that he would fight up to his knees in blood for the state Church, is the very capital of this high order, and the most *religious* man alive—a snug private duel or two notwithstanding, which *such religion* allows.

Seeing that there is no religion in any country, but that of the state church, it seems to us that the *Scottish* peer must be worse bestead than his English brethren. In Scotland he must attend the kirk, of course, as matter of conscience; but to fraternize with that body *here*, would constitute him a Dissenter; that is, an infidel—and who would be an infidel? *Here*, therefore, he attends the Church of England as a matter of conscience also; what is *religion* on one side the Tweed, being according to state-church doctrine, infidelity on the other. So that, instead of not affording to keep one conscience, he is obliged to maintain two; one for each kingdom.

We hope our readers are convinced that the middle classes are 'rogues all'; one half of the lower orders only a *little* better, and that the Tory protégés among the latter, and the aristocracy, are the only people in the kingdom, who, as Baillie Jarvie says, are 'decent, sponisible persons.'

Heavy complaints—and as just as heavy—are made against the government of the United States for their want of honor, and breaches of faith in their national transactions with the Indians. We shall give an example.

'To enumerate the multiplied breaches of faith towards the Indians would swell out this work to an extra volume. It was a bitter sarcasm of the Seminole chief, who, referring to the terms used in the treaties, told the Indian agents, that the white man's '*for ever*,' did not last *long enough*. Even in its payment of the trifling sums for the lands sold by the Indians, and resold at an enormous profit, the American government has not been willing to adhere to its agreement; and two years ago, when the Indians came for their money, the American government told them, like an Israelite dealer, that they must take half money and half goods. The Indians remonstrated; the chiefs replied, our young men have purchased upon credit, as they are wont to do; they require the dollars, to pay honestly what they owe.

'Is our great father so poor?' said one chief to the Indian agent, 'I will lend him some money;' and he ordered several thousand dollars to be brought, and offered them to the agent.



'In the Florida war, to which I shall again refer, the same want of faith has been exercised. Unable to drive the Indians out of their swamps and morasses, they have persuaded them to come into a council, under a flag of truce. This flag of truce has been violated, and the Indians have been thrown into prison, until they could be sent away into the far west, that is, if they survive their captivity which the gallant Osceola could not.'—Vol. ii. pp. 201, 202.

We need do no more than merely allude to the forcible occupation of the Texas.

All these, and many other things, are attributed in part to the want of moral principle in the government, and in part, also, to the inability of that government to resist the will of the majority. Far be it from us to attempt an extenuation or an apology for such flagrant wrong; but when it is imputed to the want of moral principle in a popular government, and to the ascendancy of the majority—another name for democracy—we take leave to dispute the principle. Will Captain Marryat tell us by what kind of government the inhabitants of the Carib Islands were exterminated, by cruel labor, gunpowder, and bloodhounds? By what governments the infamous partition of Poland was effected, and its name erased from the list of independent nations? Or, to come nearer home, by what government the native princes of India were insulted, attacked, and deprived of their hereditary kingdoms, with the loss of thousands upon thousands of lives, and millions upon millions of subjects?

We could almost imagine from the beginning of chapter sixteen, vol. ii., that the author means merely to assert, that the American constitution was only not better than others; but he has been evidently laboring to prove it worse. If he did not think it so, what right has he to attempt to do it serious injury? If others are no better, why denounce this? He might as well attack our own institutions, as those that are no worse. The fact is, that this same will of the majority has always been a bugbear to persons of the author's opinions. The Tory maxim is, that government is intended for the benefit of the governors; that is, of the minority. The executive, of course, must always be in the hands of a minority; but it should be that minority which would consult the interests of the whole, and not that which will consider no interests but its own. It signifies little in effect, whether such atrocities as we have noticed are committed by a people too strong to be controlled by a government, or by a government too strong to be controlled by a people: but the attempt to charge them all upon democracy is so absurd, that it can only be accounted for by that obliquity, which the best formed minds are fated to contract, when forced into the mould of Toryism.

The errors of the voluntary system of religion are, according

to our author, one cause of the demoralization of the American people.

'The power of the clergy is destroyed, and the tyranny of the laity has produced the effect of the outward form having been substituted for the real feeling, and hypocrisy has been but too often substituted for religion.'—Vol. ii. p. 144.

The words tyranny and power should change places in the above sentence. The meaning of this is, that where the clergy have power, and can force a living from an unwilling people, they need not wear a mask; but may fearlessly indulge in any propensity, to which habit or constitution impel them. In this manner the 'imperfections of our natures may be fairly met;' and the people may condemn them if they like; but whether they like or not, they must pay them. Whereas among the voluntaries, the clergy must keep up at least the appearance of religion for their own sakes: a high though unintentional compliment to the voluntary system, from the mouth of an enemy. As these good people keep up the appearance of religion, Captain Marryat of course is able to read the heart; how else could he detect hypocrisy, when every outward indication of it was wanting? We cannot conceive how religion should prosper less in the hands of men who are respected and rewarded according to their labors and their usefulness, than in those of stall-fed worldlings, who are prodigally endowed for doing nothing—or worse. We had forgotten, however, while writing the last sentence, that supporting a state-church and hating Dissenters is religion,

We need not enter into any discussion on the voluntary principle; our readers are acquainted with the subject; and as to our opponents, it is a part of their *religion* to read and hear nothing that can be offered by, or for, Dissenters;\* for which reason they are just as competent to form an opinion on the matter as a judge would be to decide a cause, after hearing the evidence on one side only. Hence it arises, that the numberless attacks of our opponents are directed against opinions that were never entertained, and positions that were never occupied.

We like an occasional illustration as well as Captain Marryat, it makes a point so much more intelligible. The night before the battle of Barnet, King Edward had placed his army before that of the enemy in such a manner, that his right wing greatly

---

\* We should like to know how many clergymen above the rank of a curate, have read John Search, or Dr. Wardlaw's Lectures—the latter work, we are glad to see, is now to be had for a shilling, and is within the reach of every one.

outflanked their left, leaving nothing opposed to their right. The Earl of Warwick, whose artillery was more numerous than the king's, and who had placed it in his right wing, taking for granted that his enemy was before him, kept up a furious cannonade in that direction; and Edward, with his usual tact, commanded perfect silence to be kept in his army, that the earl might not discover his mistake. The consequence was, that Warwick fired away all night at trees and bushes, leaving the position of his adversary untouched. In return for which piece of complaisance, and in a great measure in consequence of it, his aforesaid adversary thrashed him soundly the next morning. If Captain Marryat has nothing better to do, he may extract the moral of this.

That the voluntary system is the system of the United States, we conceive to be one of the best signs of the times for *them*. They have much to reform as well as others; but the living Christianity that is among them is sufficient for the purpose—time and opportunity allowed—or rather time; the opportunity must be created, and the capability for aggressive warfare, is one of the best attributes of the voluntary system. There are many heavy crimes on the public conscience doubtless, and the gravest of them all is slavery. But a vigorous Christianity nevertheless, is the lever that will move them all. We do not wonder that men who are blind to the existence, and ignorant of the power of such a principle, should miscalculate the prospects of America. Heaven forbid, that she should ever be so dead to the lessons of wisdom and experience, as to establish within her that very despotism, from the cruelty and insolence of which the pilgrim-fathers fled!

There is much of common sense and apparently of practical knowledge, in the dissertation on the state of Canada, and on this subject we are happy to agree with the author.

The most extraordinary part of the third volume is the author's reply to the *Edinburgh Review*; which would almost deserve a place amongst the curiosities of literature, were it not that it is the exact counterpart of almost every review that emanates from the party with which the author is connected. As it is not often that this kind of thing comes fairly before us for notice, we shall expend a few observations upon it, especially, as by doing so, we shall still further pursue the course which we have prescribed to ourselves.

The worthy Captain is wonderfully 'wrathy' that any one should presume to question his reckoning, or cross his course; did he expect to 'go-a-head' 'like a streak of lightning' in the old tub, 'Tory,' that sails like a hay-stack; and that too with no one even to fire a shot athwart her bows? Did he think because he threw down the gauntlet with such an invincible air,



that no one would dare to take it up? It has been taken up, and if he is right, by a woman. What did he look for?

‘Let not him that sows the dragon’s teeth,  
Expect a peaceful harvest.’\*

Our author ascribes the article in the *Edinburgh Review* to the pen of Miss Martineau; how justly or otherwise we cannot tell. He judges, he says, by the peculiarities of the style, but especially by the remarks of Miss M. on the merits of Miss M., which, in *his* mind, establish the conviction, that the major part of the article, if not the whole, is hers. In *his* mind it may; we will venture to say, however, that in every candid mind it would establish just the contrary. The hostility shown to this lady throughout these volumes is astonishing; but in the ‘reply’ the Martineau-phobia appears in a perfectly rabid state. Mere political partizanship could surely never induce even in a Tory, such—yes, we think we *may* say—hatred. There must be some deeper cause, surely—no affair of the heart we hope. The author then goes on to say, ‘The *Edinburgh Review* will no doubt most positively deny that Miss M. had any thing to do with the review of my work.’ He then tells a story in which the words ‘incorrigible liar,’ in italics, are evidently applied to the *Edinburgh* reviewer; and finishes by saying, ‘The very circumstance of its denial would with me be sufficient to establish that fact;’ very fair, and very honorable to the writer! This is the kind of thing which Tories always bring forward when they have no reason or argument on their side; attacks on *private character* are regular ingredients in their reviews.

At page 298, we find the following charge brought against the *Edinburgh* reviewer, ‘There is a malevolent feeling in the assertion, that I have treated *all* previous writers on America with contempt; and here again he *intentionally quotes falsely* (the italics are ours), my words are the *majority* of those who have preceded me.’ Such a charge, if proved, would destroy the credit of *any* reviewer. Now, let us see the other side. Page 306, Captain Marryat says, ‘But the reviewer in his virulence, has not been satisfied with attacking me; he has thought it necessary to libel the *whole* profession to which I belong. He has the folly and impertinence to make the following remark. ‘No landsman can have been on board of a ship a week without coming to the conclusion, that a *sensible house dog* is more like the people he has left at home, than most of his new companions; and that it (the house dog) would be nearly as

---

\* Schiller's *Wallenstein*.

“capable of solving problems on national character.” Page 308, ‘House dogs ! hear this, ye public of England, a sensible ‘house dog is to be preferred to St. Vincent, Nelson, Collingwood, Exmouth, and all those great men,’ &c.

The Edinburgh reviewer says no such thing. He does not say a word of Nelson, &c., or of any *great* men: he says ‘*most* ‘of his companions,’ or the ‘majority;’ and even were the four above-named noblemen in one ship together, they would not be the *most*, or ‘majority,’ even of the officers. The reviewer, then, has not libelled *them*, nor such as they; much less the *whole* profession. Now, let us for a moment imagine ourselves promoted into the Edinburgh reviewer, and see how we should rewrite Captain Marryat’s own sentence. ‘There is a malevolent ‘feeling in the assertion, that we have libelled the *whole* profession, and here again he (the author) *intentionally quotes falsely*; ‘our words are *most* (a ‘majority’) of his new companions.’

Now, worthy Captain, are not *you* rather ashamed of *yourself*? You have used foul language to the reviewer for doing precisely what you have done yourself; indeed, you have done worse, for to false quotation you have added misrepresentation. You are not to make one law for others, and another for yourself; either the reviewer had *not* a malevolent feeling, and did *not* intentionally quote falsely, or *you* had and did the same—and worse.

We admire the naval profession, and certainly do not admire the taste which compared its members to house dogs; good dogs they surely are (we mean no disparagement), for they have kept the wolf from the door, and the nation knows it.

Miss Martineau, like every body else, has doubtless much to be thankful for, and for this among the rest—that abuse kills nobody. Her opinions have been incessantly assailed, now come a few personalities. At page 304, she is attacked, on the authority, be it observed, of certain anonymous ‘young ladies’ (who most probably would never have been quoted or perhaps credited, had they narrated any thing to her advantage), for having sat down, ‘surrounded by young ladies, and amused them with ‘all the histories of her former loves.’ ‘And I said to myself, ‘who would have supposed that this Solon in petticoats would ‘ever have dwelt upon her former days of enthusiasm and hope, ‘or have cherished the reminiscences of love?’ Very feeling and gentlemanly! Again,

‘I was conversing with a lady at New York, who informed me that she had seen a letter from Miss Martineau, written to a friend of hers, after her return to England, in which Miss M. declared, that her door was so besieged by the carriages of the nobility, that it was quite uncomfortable, and that she hardly knew what to do.’

It is then insinuated that no carriage but that of Lord

Brougham is ever seen at her door, and of course that the foregoing statement is false.

'But when I heard this I was pleased, for I said to myself, 'So, then, this champion of democracy, this scorner of rank and title is flattered by the carriages of the nobility crowding at her door.'

Miss M., it seems, has said, that 'human nature is everywhere the same,' and all this impertinent personality is written and printed forsooth, to prove the truth of the assertion. The following extract from vol. i. p. 183, relates to some political discussions in America, and is quoted by the author to prove the extent to which defamation is carried in *that* country, and amongst *democrats* and *voluntaries*.

'Party spirit has entered the *recesses* of retirement; violated the sanctity of female character, invaded the tranquillity of private life, &c. A licentious and destroying spirit has gone forth, regardless of every thing but the gratification of malignant feelings, and unworthy aspirations.' 'The decencies of private life were disregarded; CONVERSATIONS AND CORRESPONDENCE, which should have been confidential, were brought before the public eye; the ruthless warfare was carried into the bosom of private life; neither age nor sex was spared.'

Such things as these, of course, could never happen under monarchy, and an established church!

We suppose these apocryphal stories are intended to convict Miss M. of vanity. Vanity! there is more vanity in the 'reply' alone, than would weigh down all that is imputed to Miss M., and herself to boot. But granting that she has her little vanities, what in the name of common sense has that to do with the merits of the article in the *Edinburgh Review*, or with Miss M.'s judgment in political economy? Suppose Captain Marryat should apply for an appointment at the Admiralty, and that very logical personage, the secretary, should say to him, 'Give you a ship, indeed; you boasted the other day that you had severely punished the *Edinburgh reviewer*; what can you know of navigation?' Of course this answer should be quite satisfactory. Captain M. talks of getting the *Edinburgh reviewer* into an 'everlasting awkward fix;' but other people can get into awkward fixes quite as well. Captain M., for instance, seems to be dreadfully sore about Miss M.'s review: if he is, his feelings and his assertions are at decided variance; if he is not, his personalities to Miss M. are perfectly heartless and inexcusable.

And now come up the Triarii, the constant reserve of Tories and high Churchmen; the charges of sedition and infidelity which are regularly brought against all who differ from their opinions on matters of policy and religion. Our readers expected this, of course, but we have a few words to say on this subject also.



The passage in the Edinburgh Review, on which these charges are professedly founded, is as follows (we say *professedly*, because the charges would have been as surely made, though the shadow of a foundation had been wanting): 'An ardent pursuit of wealth and deep religious feeling go very well together.' Our author is wonderfully indignant at this; and quotes text upon text against it, with as much earnestness as though the whole bench of bishops believed them—and acted accordingly: such as, 'Ye cannot serve God and Mammon,' and that whole class of Scripture axioms, which neither we, nor any of our readers, we presume, dispute. We only propose to show, that the condemnation of the person who wrote the sentence, would have come with a much better grace from a more immaculate quarter.

Miss Martineau—poor Miss Martineau—has said that 'the habit of intemperance is *not infrequent* among women of station and education in the most enlightened parts of the country,' implying, says our author, that it is a *general habit* among the American women (it implies no such thing); and he goes on to say,

'The origin of this slander I know well, and the only ground for it is, that there are two or three ladies of a certain city, who having been worked upon by some of the *evangelical revival ministers*, have had their minds crushed by the continual excitement to which they have been subjected. The mind affects the body, and they have required, and have applied to, stimulus; and if you will inquire into the moral state of any woman among the higher classes, either in America or England, who has fallen into the vice alluded to, nine times out of ten you will find, that it has been brought about by *religious excitement*. Fanaticism (i. e. evangelical religion, see the context) and gin are remarkably good friends all over the world.'—Vol. ii. pp. 24, 25.

St. Paul says, 1 Corinthians vi. 10, that drunkards shall not inherit the kingdom of God; and he repeats it in Galatians vi. 21: but Captain Marryat says, 'Fanaticism (evangelical religion) and gin are *remarkably good friends*.' Again, Captain Marryat considers that the laws relating to divorce are much too strict in this country; and that some half dozen causes for it should be allowed, instead of the *one* permitted by the Scripture. Our Saviour says, Matt. v. 32, 'Whosoever shall put away his wife, saving for the cause of fornication, causeth her to commit adultery; and whosoever shall marry her that is divorced, committeth adultery.' 'No,' says Captain M., 'it certainly appears *to me* to be reasonable to suppose, that those laws by which the *imperfection of our natures* may be fairly *met* (that is, provided *for*), and which tended to diminish the aggregate of crime (by committing one to prevent another), must be more acceptable *to our Divine Master*, than any, which however they may be

‘in spirit more rigidly conformable to his precepts, are found in ‘their working not to succeed.’—vol. ii. p. 30. That is, our Divine Master, who made the heart, does not know how to govern it; and the more rigidly our laws conform to the *spirit of his precepts*, the worse they work; and Captain M. will be happy to teach Him better. Now, Quære. If the Edinburgh reviewer is an infidel, what is Captain Marryat?\*

We must now make a few general observations, while our space suffices. In the first place, we would just hint to Captain M. (like his friend Mr. Chucks, with the greatest delicacy imaginable), that there are two sides to most questions; that to oppose the political doctrines of Tories is no more sedition in a Whig, than to controvert the principles of Whig statesmen is sedition in a Tory: and that a conscientious opposition to a secular church is no more infidelity in a reviewer, than a constant vituperation of Dissenters and their institutions is infidelity in a bishop—both are infidelity, or neither is. And now, having told the author what is not sedition and infidelity, we will tell him what is. When a man at a public dinner gets up, and uses abuse and even threats, to the highest personage in the realm, *that* is sedition. When Tory clergymen† hunt in couples over the kingdom, and endeavor to raise dissatisfaction and opposition to her Majesty’s government, and even proceed, the one to denounce her as *no Christian*; and the other to call her ‘that woman Jezabel;’ *this* is sedition.‡ A disbelief in the *religion of the evangelists* is *infidelity*; and when we consider that the clergymen above alluded to, are the very men who when their party was in power, were constantly preaching to Dissenters and others, the *scriptural* duty of passive obedience and non-resistance even to tyranny; and the heinous sin of speaking evil of dignities; their conduct, *on Captain M.’s own principles*, comes pretty near to infidelity as well as his own. We quote his own ‘reply’ against all three. ‘If they acknowledge the Scriptures, they must at the same time acknowledge their own grievous error, and we may add, their deep sin; if on the contrary they still hold to their own opinion, have they not denied their faith, and are they not worse than infidels?’—vol. iii. p. 303.

---

\* Since writing the above, we have turned to the Edinburgh Review, and it certainly appears to us from the context, that the writer merely meant to express the Scripture doctrine, that a man may be diligent in business—yet fervent in spirit serving God. The offence arises from this ‘*infidel*’ having given the author a well merited rebuke for the flippancy and lightness with which he speaks on religious subjects.

† The Reverends Gregg and M’Neile.

‡ Here is another ‘everlasting awkward fix.’ Either the Tory spirituals must admit their tool to be a seditious libeller, or the head of their immaculate and apostolic Church, to be no Christian.

It is pretty plainly hinted that the Edinburgh reviewer will receive his reward *below*! All this is very small and cheap. It would be neither more difficult nor less true, for others to say of the Quarterly Review as much as Captain M. has said of the Edinburgh, nor for us to assert, that if the Edinburgh reviewer be so consigned, he need not be surprised to find himself in company with a certain person bearing her Majesty's commission. But we have no wish to say any thing of the kind, and we hope better things of both: but it is very disgusting to see with what readiness and self-complacency these exclusive moralists and religionists

'Presume heaven's bolts to throw,  
And deal damnation round the land,  
On each *they* judge its foe.'

Or rather their own foe,—for after all that is the secret!

In the mean time, these things speak volumes. The Tories in their convulsive struggles for existence, have clung to the Church; and, as political corruption is next of kin to spiritual, the Church has felt the link of nature draw it, and has fraternized with them at once. And now—whoever opposes Tory ascendancy is *sedition*; whoever attacks the corruptions of the Church, and wishes for a purer form of Christianity, is an infidel! Can there be any stronger proof of the most childish ignorance of human nature—of the most rooted hatred to the right of private judgment? Let the people of England look to it! Were these men in possession of unmolested power, sedition and infidelity, now mere words, would very speedily become *things*; aye, and be acted upon as such. In the hands of such men as these it is impossible that civil or religious liberty should ever be held sacred. Again we say, let the people of England look to this!

It is true, that Toryism in its latest struggles has occasionally put on such shows of liberality and justice as have almost made it lovely. They are fleeting all, though fair; like the varying colors of the expiring dolphin, which render the rapacious monster beautiful in death.

Captain Marryat charges the Edinburgh reviewer with want of tact; he has shown, we apprehend, much greater want of it himself; in confessing, in the first place, that every paragraph in his work was written after great consideration; and, secondly, that the whole was intended to answer a preconceived purpose: two admissions which, coupled together, entirely destroy the little authority that might otherwise attach to his work. It reminds us of a stanza in that celebrated composition the Devil's Walk.



' Down the river did glide, with wind and tide,  
 A pig with vast celerity,  
 And the devil grinned, for he saw all the while  
 How it cut its own throat, and he thought with a smile,  
 Of England's commercial prosperity !'

Had this stanza been written recently, the last line might have run—

' Of Captain Marryat's ' Diary !' '

The sum of the whole is this. In one point Captain Marryat may have succeeded to his wish, that is, in convincing those who are not capable of judging for themselves. In every other, we conceive that he has failed. We consider some of his facts as very questionable; but, even granting them all, they do not bear out his inferences. He has *not* proved that a democratic form of government is — *cæteris paribus*—worse than any other. He has *not*, therefore, done 'serious injury to the cause of democracy.' And, granting that he had proved democracy to be bad, he has *not* proved that Toryism is better. He has *not*, therefore, 'assisted the cause of conservatism.' In our minds, indeed, the same conclusion might have been built on far more general grounds; for the man who avowedly leaves his impartiality behind him, while he proceeds to form his judgment, can never be entitled to our confidence on any matter of opinion.

One word to the reader and we have done. Have you never been struck by the strong internal evidence in the writings of high Churchmen and Tories, that they consider the cause of evangelical religion, and that of the voluntary system, to be *one*. Never do they aim a blow at the one, without immediately repeating it at the other; a sufficient proof, we think, that there exists even in their minds a latent conviction, that the two must stand or fall together. Their opposition to both can arise from one of two causes only; and either is sufficient for our purpose. It must proceed, either from an *intelligent* dislike to evangelical religion—the religion of Christ and his evangelists—as *such*, and to the voluntary system as a necessary deduction from it; or, from an utter *ignorance* of the nature and the modes of acting, of that religion and that system which they venture to impugn.

Art. IV. *Memoirs of the Court of England during the Reign of the Stuarts, including the Protectorate.* By JOHN HENEAGE JESSE. Two vols. 8vo. London: Bentley. 1840.

IT is somewhat mortifying, but not wholly uninstruc- tive, to observe the superficial and confused knowledge of English history, which prevails even amongst the better informed classes of our countrymen. To say nothing of remote things, of the druidical and Saxon age, or even of the centuries which intervened from the Norman Conquest to the establishment of the Tudor race, this remark holds good in relation to the comparatively modern period to which the volumes before us refer. Certain events stand out prominently, and are recognized by all; every man knows that Charles the First was opposed by his parliament, that the plea of liberty was raised on the one side and that of prerogative on the other, that hostile armies met on English ground, where brother fought against brother, and father against son, that the monarch was at length worsted, his person seized, and by open adjudication assigned to the block. Every English youth can talk of the royalists and the roundheads, can glory in the chivalry of the one, or exult in the puritanic severity and martial prowess of the other. These are things to be met with everywhere and on any day, and to a hasty observer it may in consequence appear, that a creditable portion of historical information is current amongst the people. But the illusion soon vanishes, and the diligent inquirer discovers only crude, meagre, undigested, and partizan views of history. The mere outline of past events is traced,—the filling up is wholly wanting. The broad, palpable, and coarse are known; what is physical is apprehended; the mere outward and visible man is seen; but the nicer shades of character distinguishing individuals or parties, the latent influences which work unseen, and are discovered only by their results, the strange combinations of good and evil which appertain to all alike, the accumulative forces which pressed upon the particular period, and determined mainly its character, these and a hundred other things are rarely apprehended or even thought of, and the popular mind, therefore, possesses only dark and impalpable views of the period in question.

Let the names of Charles and Cromwell be obliterated, let the battles of Marston Moor and Naseby be forgotten, let the execution of the king, and the temporary establishment of a Commonwealth be lost sight of, and the whole field of vision will present little that is definite and tangible to the English mind. There will still, indeed, be retained a general impression, derived from the report of parliamentary discussions, high minded patriotism,

and deep intriguing tyranny ; but it will be so undefined and cloudlike as to exert no perceptible influence on the national judgment. The civil strife with all its premonitory and consequent facts, the momentous interests it involved, the developments of character it supplied, its influence on our habits, passions, and institutions ; all these would, in such case, be passed over—as they actually are for the most part—with a few vague generalities, expressive of praise or censure, of sympathy or regret. This is not as it should be, and we rejoice in every judicious effort to supply the deficiency. Happily we are not without hopeful symptoms of a better era. A new spirit has come over our historical literature. Men of diligent research and of painstaking accuracy, superior to past prejudices, and with every needful intellectual endowment, have devoted themselves to the investigation of historical documents, and the result has been the clearing up of many difficulties, and the substitution of plain realities for the conjectures of imagination and the romance of party zeal.

Two classes of publications are needed for the correction of the evil to which we have adverted, and we rejoice to believe that both are in the course of being supplied. Their merits, in an intellectual point of view, are very diverse, but he will deserve well of his countrymen, and will contribute not a little to the purification of our political ethics, and the advancement of our social welfare, who contributes either. The great difficulty to be mastered is the bringing ourselves into immediate, life-like and sympathetic union with the past ; to see the men of a former day as they appeared to the contemporaries amongst whom they walked and with whom they acted, fresh and living, with the impulses of the hour upon them, and the emotions springing thence beaming on their countenances. It is not at a levee that the characters of men are to be learnt, nor can the spirit and impersonation of a former age be traced out by an investigation, however minute and laborious, of the public life of a few distinguished men. There is a large void to be filled, and it is not enough that a solitary figure, here and there, should be brought back to retrace its course : the whole must be crowded with sentient, moving, stirring beings, actuated by the passions of the day, and engaged in the hearty pursuit of their various and cherished purposes. The ideal must give place to the actual, the vague generality to the collection of individuals, each, in his separate sphere, and with his personal predilections or antipathies moving onward to his appointed goal. Nor are we wanting in materials for such a re-creation of the past. The men and women of a former day, especially those who imprinted a character on their age, yet remain amongst us, and require only to be disinterred. The unransacked treasures of our noble language only wait the bidding



of some magician—some historic Scott—to come forth from dusty folios, or from neglected pamphlets the very spirit of their age, in all the forms and fantastic moods of a forgotten day. Let but the right intellect appear, an intellect at once imaginative and practical, nice in its perceptions, discriminative in its judgment, free to a great extent from the artificial characteristics of the passing generation, and full of sympathy with humanity at large, and we shall soon see the past standing out in real and veritable forms, speaking to us in its own tones, and disclosing with an accuracy which will exclude all doubt, the secret of its achievements and its failures.

Let these materials be supplied, and the philosophic historian will be found at his post to analyze and combine them. Men of calm and searching intellects will not be wanting to investigate the principles of our common nature, to trace out remote and hidden causes, to develop the order which has been maintained amid apparent confusion, and to shed upon the future history of our race, the light of that practical wisdom with which the past is so richly fraught. We have already an earnest of this in 'The Constitutional History of England,' and may yet live to see much accomplished. Amid the many cheering indications of the times, we account it by no means the least promising, that our historical literature is in the course of being redeemed from its past disgraceful subjection to party prejudices,—that it is beginning to utter an impartial testimony, to measure with even-handed justice the men of all parties, to render itself, in a word, the handmaid of truth, and the friend of humanity at large.

The volumes now before us, and which have given occasion for these reflections, belong to the former of the two classes of publications we have specified. They are not in some respects what we could wish, yet as indicative of the public taste, and as suited to promote a further cultivation of this department of history, we rejoice in their appearance. They consist of private memoirs and of personal anecdotes, and display commendable diligence in the collection of materials. 'It occurred to the author,' his preface informs us, 'that the private history of the reigns of the Stuarts and of the Protectorate,—their families, and others intimately connected with the Court,—would present a series of agreeable and instructive anecdotes; would furnish the means of introducing the reader to the principal personages of their day, and of exhibiting the monarch and the statesman in their undress; while, at the same time, it would afford an insight into human character, and a picture of the manners of the age.'

The personages introduced are the members of the Stuart family, with their favorites and courtiers, and the plan pursued is to collect, in a series of biographical notices, the anecdotes

illustrative of personal character and history, which are scattered throughout our literature. Many of these are undoubtedly trifling, and in themselves unworthy of preservation, but taken as a whole, they serve an important end, combine instruction with amusement, and may perhaps dispose some volatile readers to prosecute inquiry into the more laborious and productive departments of history. The nature of the work will be best comprehended from a few extracts which we now proceed to give. The first respects the early days of James I., and furnishes a singular specimen of the times, as well as an interesting illustration of the character of the celebrated historian Buchanan, the tutor of this future Solomon. The coarseness of the anecdote must be excused, in consideration of the value of the light it throws on the character of the intrepid tutor of royalty.

'James was a pedant even when a boy. His tutor, the famous historian Buchanan, though he communicated to him a portion of his learning, imparted but little of his own elegant taste to his royal pupil. In the treatment of his charge, he appears not only to have been laudably uninfluenced by rank and circumstance, but to have behaved himself towards James as the most rigid disciplinarian. On one occasion the young King was engaged in some boisterous sport, with his playfellow the Master of Erskine, at a time when Buchanan was deeply engaged in his studies. The tutor was annoyed, and declared that he would administer a sound flogging if the interruption continued. James announced stoutly that he should like to see *who would bell the cat*; at which the tutor started up, threw away his book, and performed the threatened chastisement most effectually. The Countess of Mar, hearing the King's cries, rushed into the apartment, and catching the boy in her arms, inquired authoritatively of Buchanan, how he dared to touch the Lord's Anointed? 'Madam,' replied the imperturbable tutor, 'I have whipped his Majesty's breech, and you 'may kiss it if you please.'.....

'Such an impression had Buchanan's discipline produced on the mind of James, that many years afterwards, when King of England, the miseries of his tutelage, and the austerity of his old master, continued vividly to haunt his imagination. He used to say of a certain person about his court, that he trembled at his approach, 'he reminded 'him so of his pedagogue.' And on another occasion, he is described as dreadfully agitated by the appearance of his former corrector in a dream, and as vainly endeavouring to soften the fanciful displeasure which he had incurred. These are curious illustrations of the independence of mind in the one, and the constitutional timidity of the other. It may be observed that, in his writings, James more than once speaks slighting, and even acrimoniously, of his old tutor.

'The elegant Buchanan was far from satisfied with the mere progress which his pupil had made in classical and theological learning. At a certain audience, which was given by James to a foreign ambassador in his boyhood, it was found necessary that the conversation should take

place in Latin. The foreigner happened to be guilty of several grammatical errors, in every one of which James, with equal pedantry and ill-breeding, thought proper to set him right. The ambassador accidentally meeting Buchanan, after the audience was at an end, inquired of him how he came to make his illustrious pupil a pedant. 'I was 'happy,' said the historian, 'to be able to accomplish even that.'

—Vol. i. pp. 8—10.

The king's aversion to business is well known, and showed itself in early life. The following anecdote illustrates the mode in which Buchanan attempted to correct his indolence.

'He showed his aversion to business at a very early age; so much so, that he was in the habit of signing whatever papers were brought to him, without reading or making himself acquainted with their contents. To correct this pernicious habit, his tutor Buchanan adopted the following scheme:—One day, when the young king was preparing to set out on a hunting excursion, he placed before him a document containing a formal abdication of his kingdom. It was signed, as usual, without inquiry into its purport. On the return of James in the evening, Buchanan produced the paper, and pointed out its contents. At the sight of what he had done, the king burst into tears. Buchanan comforted him by throwing the document into the fire; at the same time seizing the opportunity of enlarging on the injustice which he might be guilty of to others, as well as to himself, should he hereafter persist in so indolent and injurious a practice.'

—Ib. p. 12.

The character of James was singularly deficient in all qualities meriting respect. It was a compound of imbecility, affectation, and vice, only slightly glossed over by a show of learning, and the loud profession of religious zeal. The king, as is well known, esteemed himself more learned in theology than all his bishops, and was encouraged in the notion by their disgusting flatteries. His conduct at the Hampton Court Conference, to which, by the bye, Mr. Jesse does not allude, called forth their loudest plaudits. Whitgift declared 'that undoubtedly his majesty spake by the 'special assistance of God's Spirit,' and Bancroft, his worthy successor, protested upon his knees 'that his heart melted within 'him with joy, and made haste to acknowledge unto Almighty 'God the singular mercy we have received at his hands, in giving 'us such a king, as, since Christ's time, the like, he thought, had 'not been.' 'The bishops seemed much pleased,' says Sir John Harrington, a courtier, and bitter enemy of the Puritans, in writing to his wife an account of this conference, at which he had been present, 'and said his majesty spoke by the power of inspiration. *I wist not what they mean, but the Spirit was rather*



*'foul-mouthed.'*\* How much more accurately the courtier judged on this occasion than the bishops, may be inferred from the following account of the shameless immoralities practised at court, and in which his majesty heartily participated. It is contained in a letter from Sir John Harrington to Mr. Secretary Barlow, and is dated London, 1606:—the King of Denmark, brother to the queen of James, being then on a visit in England.

“ In compliance with your asking, now shall you accept my poor account of rich doings. I came here a day or two before the Danish King came, and from the day he had come to the present hour, I have been well nigh overwhelmed with carousal and sports of all kinds. The sports began each day in such manner and such sort, as well nigh persuaded me of Mahomet's paradise. We had women, and indeed wine too, of such plenty, as would have astonished each beholder. Our feasts were magnificent, and the two royal guests did most lovingly embrace each other at the table. I think the Dane hath strangely wrought upon our good English Nobles; for those whom I could never get to taste good English liquor, now follow the fashion, and wallow in beastly delights. The ladies abandon their sobriety, and are seen to roll about in intoxication. In good sooth, the Parliament did kindly to provide his Majesty so seasonably with money; for there has been no lack of good living, shows, sights, and banqueting from morn to eve.

“ One day a great feast was held; and after dinner the representation of Solomon's temple, and the coming of the Queen of Sheba was made, or (as I may better say) was meant to have been made, before their majesties, by device of the Earl of Salisbury and others. But alas! as all earthly things do fail to poor mortals in earthly enjoyments, so did prove our presentment thereof. The lady who did play the Queen's part did carry most precious gifts to both their Majesties; but, forgetting the steps arising to the canopy, overset her caskets into his Danish Majesty's lap, and fell at his feet, though I rather think it was in his face. Much was the hurry and confusion; cloths and napkins were at hand, to make all clean. His Majesty then got up, and would dance with the Queen of Sheba; but he fell down and humbled himself before her, and was carried to an inner chamber, and laid on a bed of state, which was not a little defiled with the presents of the Queen, which had been bestowed on his garments; such as wine, cream, jelly, beverage, cakes, spices, and other good matters. The entertainment and show went forward, and most of the presenters went backward or fell down; wine did so occupy their upper chambers.

“ Now did appear in rich dress, Hope, Faith, and Charity; Hope did assay to speak, but wine rendered her endeavours so feeble that she withdrew, and hoped the King would excuse her levity. Faith was then all alone; for I am certain she was not joined to good works,

---

\* *Nugæ Antiquæ* 1. 181.

and left the court in a staggering: Charity came to the King's feet, and seemed to cover the multitude of sins her sisters had committed; in some sort she made obeisance, and brought gifts, but said she would return home again, as there was no gift which Heaven had not already given his Majesty. She then returned to Faith and Hope who were both sick in the lower hall.

“Next came Victory, in bright armor, and presented a rich sword to the King, who did not accept it, but put it by with his hand; and by a strange medley of versification did endeavour to make suit to the King. But Victory did not triumph long; for after much lamentable utterance, she was led away by a silly captive, and laid to sleep in the outer steps of the ante-chamber.

“Now did Peace make entry, and strive to get foremost to the King; but I grieve to tell how great wrath she did discover unto those of her attendants; and much contrary to her semblance, made rudely war with her olive-branch, and laid on the pates of those who did oppose her coming.

“I have much marvelled at those strange pageantries; and they do bring to my remembrance what passed of this sort in our Queen's days, of which I was sometime an humble spectator and assistant; but I never did see such lack of good order, discretion, and sobriety, as I now have done. I have passed much time in seeing the royal sports of hunting and hawking, where the manners were such as made me devise the beasts were pursuing the sober creation, and not man in quest of exercise and food. I will now, in good sooth, declare unto you, who will not blab, that the gunpowder fright is got out of all our heads, and we are going on hereabouts as if the devil was contriving every man to blow up himself, by wild riot, excess, and devastation of time and temperance. The great ladies do go well masked, and indeed it be the only show of their modesty to conceal their countenances: but alack! they meet with such countenance to uphold their strange doings, that I marvel not at aught that happens. The lord of the mansion is overwhelmed in preparations at Theobalds, and doth marvelously please both Kings with good meat, good drink, and good speeches. I do often say (but not aloud) that the Danes have again conquered the Britons, for I see no man, or woman either, that can command herself. I wish I was at home;—*O rus, quando te aspiciam!* and I will before Prince Vaudemont cometh.”—Ib. pp. 54—57.

So much for the first of the Stuarts who occupied the English throne. We now pass to the more stirring and tragical times of Charles,—a remarkable epoch in our history under whatever aspect it be viewed. The private character of princes is a matter of secondary moment in modern days, but it was not so in the times of the Stuarts. A slight attention to the course of our history will fully establish this fact. The latter part of the reign of Elizabeth had witnessed an outbreak of popular sentiments which taxed even her masculine understanding, and laid all the resources of her government under tribute. This was mainly

attributable to the reformation, which had quickened the inert masses, and produced a rich harvest of stirring thoughts and high-minded aspirations, where intellectual stagnation and religious formalism had previously existed. Men began, in consequence, to commune with the past as well as to anticipate the future. They travelled back beyond the times of the Tudors, carried their appeal to the better days of English freedom, and demanded that the outworks of popular rights, recently laid low by royalty, should be rebuilt, and their sacredness guaranteed by written laws. In such a state of the popular mind, it required only the interval which the reign of James afforded, to strike the roots of liberty deep into the soil of England. A monarch of undoubted courage, with competent sagacity, and a well ordered exchequer, might have delayed, if he had not wholly averted, the calamities which fell upon his son. But the timidity and folly, the favoritism and the vices of James, all conspired to undermine the loyalty of his people, and to prepare them for the daring speculations and chivalrous deeds which disturbed the quiet of his successor. Charles, unhappily for himself and the nation, was wedded to the worst precedents of recent times, and was utterly disqualified for gauging the stature and requirements of the popular mind. He saw men through the false medium of his father's shallow philosophy, and at once committed himself, with all the heedlessness of youth, and the falsehood of his race, to the most perilous enterprize which a monarch can attempt. There is, however, some truth in the remark of our author—who, by the bye, has endeavored to throw a halo of a morbid sentimentalism about this inheritor of his father's follies—that 'Charles became 'the sacrifice to a long established system of misrule, rather than 'to individual offence.' It must not, however, be forgotten, that the personal qualities of Charles,—his repulsive manners, his thorough insincerity, his fixed and deeply-rooted love of tyranny both in church and state, contributed mainly to the calamities which befell him. Had his intellect been larger, his sagacity more clear-sighted,—or had his heart been in unison with the nobler and more generous sympathies of our nature, the catastrophe might have been averted. But we are losing sight of Mr. Jesse, and of the object of this paper, and, therefore, return to our extracts.

Charles, as is well known, after a chivalrous effort to obtain in marriage a daughter of Spain, concluded an alliance with Henrietta Maria, sister of Louis the Thirteenth, the then reigning king of France. Some of the most important articles of the treaty were carefully concealed from the English people, who were strongly averse to a Popish alliance. The seeds of much future evil were thus sown, and rapidly produced a full harvest of misery. If there was one passion more prevalent



at this period than another, it was that of hatred to Popery; a passion, as thus existing, compounded of very various elements, partly generous and partly base, springing in a measure from a vigorous love of freedom, yet partaking of the meanness and illiberality which arise out of partial enlightenment and but a half purified creed. James and his son were well aware of the sentiments of the popular mind, and they criminally brought their kingcraft into play in order to evade its requirements. Their policy was apparently successful, but woe betide the king who trifles with his word, and thereby destroys the confidence of his people. The whole history of Charles is an instructive illustration of the calamities which flow from this source, and may well serve as a beacon to all future monarchs. The following is Mr. Jesse's account of the French treaty.

'After a complicated and rather lengthy negotiation, a treaty of marriage was definitively signed at Paris, on the 10th of November, 1624: It consists of articles scarcely less disgraceful to the English Court, or disadvantageous to the English nation, than those of the celebrated Spanish treaty which had preceded it. Indeed so similar are the two instruments, as well in terms as in spirit, that the one would appear almost to be a transcript of the other. The only really important alteration is in the nineteenth article of the French treaty, in which it is provided that the children born of the marriage shall be brought up by their mother, not merely to the age of ten years, as had been agreed upon in the Spanish compact, but till they should attain their thirteenth year; a dangerous concession, considering the unwearying vigilance of the Romish priests, and that it comprehended a period of life when the heart is most open to impressions whether good or evil. Some secret articles were also sworn to by James and Louis. By these it was provided that, throughout England, all Catholic prisoners should be set at liberty; that they should no longer be liable to be searched, or otherwise molested on account of their religion; and that the goods of which they had been despoiled should be restored.

'The deed of dispensation, in which Louis the Thirteenth guaranteed to the See of Rome that the King of England should faithfully fulfil the articles of the treaty, is another curious document. D'Israeli, in his ingenious work, '*the Curiosities of Literature*,' speaks of a 'remarkable and unnoticed document,' namely, 'A most solemn obligation contracted with the Pope and the Queen's brother, the King of France, to educate her children as Catholics, and only to choose Catholics to attend them.' 'Had this been known,' he adds, 'either to Charles, or to the English nation, Henrietta could never have been able to ascend the English throne.' It is a pity to disturb this justification of Charles, but unfortunately for that Monarch, there can be little doubt but that he was perfectly well acquainted with all the circumstances of the affair; indeed, the articles mentioned by Mr. D'Israeli, as most objectionable in the deed of dispensation, are in-

serted, at least in spirit, in the treaty itself; a document which, as a matter of course, had not only been seen, but had been solemnly sworn to by Charles. The subject is rendered of considerable importance, when we remember that the two children of Henrietta Maria,—Charles the second and his brother James,—who afterwards successively inherited the crown, lived and died Catholics; and that it was owing to a defect in his education that the latter died an exile, and that England became the scene of revolution in 1668.'—Vol. ii. pp. 65—67.

The French princess brought with her a numerous retinue of priests, whose folly and insolence awakened general disgust, and damaged greatly the king's government. The queen was compelled to walk barefooted to Tyburn, and according to the report of a contemporary writer, was made 'to eat her meat out of tryne (wooden) dishes, to wait at the table and serve her servants, with many other ridiculous and absurd penances.'\* Not contented with their influence over the queen, they gave serious umbrage to the king, by interfering with his domestic arrangements, and endeavoring to sow dissensions between him and his consort. The following is a curious specimen of their insolence.

'The King and Queen were banqueting in public, and, as usual, the chaplain was proceeding to say grace, when the Queen's confessor actually struck up with a Latin benediction. The King's chaplain (of course a Protestant), naturally provoked at the interruption, gave the confessor a zealous push, and then continued the grace. On this the latter went over to the Queen's side, and commenced with renewed energy his benediction. The King, however, very sensibly cut the matter short by drawing one of the dishes towards him, when the carvers instantly began their office. As soon as dinner was over, the confessor proceeded, in like manner, to return thanks; the chaplain, however, had obtained the start, when each endeavoured to drown the other by the loudness of his voice. Charles very properly took the Queen by the hand, and hastily withdrew her from the disgraceful scene.'—*Ib.* p. 71.

Through the instigations of these foreign emissaries, the palace became a scene of perpetual broils, and a resolution was in consequence taken to banish the queen's attendants from the kingdom. The Marshal de Bassompierre was despatched by the French court to effect a reconciliation, but Charles was inexorable, and for once, withstood the entreaties of his beautiful, but vain and thoughtless wife. It would have been well for him, and for the kingdom, if days of matrimonial vassalage had not followed. Mr. Jesse's account of the expulsion of the queen's attendants is too amusing and characteristic to be omitted.

---

\* Ellis's Letters, vol. iii. 238.

‘Not till the very last moment, however, when the carriages and vessels were in actual readiness for their removal, had the French been acquainted with the final determination of Charles. Having fully made up his mind, he unexpectedly entered the Queen’s apartments for the purpose of announcing it. There, to his great indignation, he beheld a number of the Queen’s domestics *irreverently dancing and curvetting* in her presence. Taking Henrietta by the hand, he led her to a private chamber, and locked himself up with her alone. In the mean time, Lord Conway had invited the French Bishop, and others of the ecclesiastics, to accompany him into St. James’s Park. Here, in a straightforward manner, he laid before them the King’s unquestionable causes for complaint, and told them plainly that every one of the party, priests as well as laymen, young and old, male and female, must instantly depart the kingdom. The Bishop replied that, as regarded himself, he stood in the light of an ambassador, and therefore could not possibly think of quitting the English Court, unless by the express directions of the King his master. However, Lord Conway informed him openly, that if he did not make up his mind to depart peacefully, there would not be the least scruple to get rid of him by force.

‘Having thus communicated with the priests, Lord Conway, attended by the Treasurer and Comptroller of the Household, suddenly made his appearance among the rest of the establishment. Acquainting them in like manner with the King’s resolution, he told them it was his Majesty’s pleasure that they should instantly depart for Somerset house, and there await his Majesty’s further instructions. The women, we are informed, commenced howling and lamenting as if they were going to execution; and, evincing the most dogged determination to remain where they were, were eventually thrust out by the yeomen of the guard, and the doors of their apartments locked behind them.

‘The same evening, when they were all assembled at Somerset-house, the King appeared in person among them. He hoped, he said, that what he had done would not be taken amiss by his brother, the King of France;—that particular persons among them, for he would not mention names, had fostered discontent between the Queen and himself, and had so embittered his domestic happiness that further endurance would be impossible. He asked their pardon, he said, if, by thus seeking his own safety and peace of mind, he interfered with their views; and concluded by adding, that his Treasurer had received orders to remunerate every one of them for their year’s service. Madame St. George, a handsome and flippant French lady, was spokeswoman on the occasion, and endeavoured to expostulate with Charles, but his reply was even more peremptory than at first. This lady was personally obnoxious to Charles, having bred more mischief between himself and the Queen, than all the rest of the colony put together. She had even had the impudence to intrude herself into the coach with the King and Queen, at a period, too, when that honor was never on any occasion allowed to a subject.

‘But the bitterest task for Charles to perform, was to encounter the sobs and remonstrances of Henrietta. That she might not behold the



departure of her favorites from Whitehall, Charles, when he parted from her, had locked the door of her apartment. Her furious conduct on this occasion exceeded all bounds; she actually tore the hair from her head, and cut her hands severely by dashing them through the glass windows in the violence of her rage.

'These events took place in the early part of July, 1626; and yet, notwithstanding the King's firmness and extreme anxiety on the subject, we find the French still domiciled at Somerset-house, after more than a month had elapsed. The patience of Charles being now entirely worn out, he dictated the following note—evidently in hearty anger—to the Duke of Buckingham.

'STEENIE,

'I have received your letter by Dic Græme; this is my answer;—I command you to send all the French away to-morrow out of the town, if you can by fair means (but stick not long in disputing), otherwise force them away, driving them away like so many wild beasts until you have shipped them, and so the devil go with them. Let me have no answer, but of the performance of my command. So I rest,

Your faithful, constant, loving friend,

'CHARLES REX.'

'Oaking, the 7th of August, 1626.'

'(Superscribed) 'The Duke of Buckingham.'

'Four days afterwards, appears the following passage in a letter of the period, dated 11th August, 1626. 'On Monday last was the peremptory day for the departure of the French; what time the King's officers attending with coaches, carts, and barges, they contumaciously refused to go, saying they would not depart till they had order from their King; and above all, the Bishop stood upon his punctilios. This news being sent in post to the King, on Tuesday morning his Majesty despatched away to London the captain of the guard, attended with a competent number of his yeomen, as likewise with heralds, messengers, and trumpeters, first, to proclaim his Majesty's pleasure at Somerset-house gate; which if it were not speedily obeyed, the yeomen of the guard were to put it in execution, by turning all the French out of Somerset-house by head and shoulders, and shutting the gate after them. Which news, as soon as the French heard, their courage came down, and they yielded to be gone next tide.'

'The appointed hour having arrived, Lord Conway, together with the Treasurer and Comptroller, proceeded to Somerset-house, to witness the departure of the malcontents. Lord Conway, with his colleagues, first attended the Bishop to the door of his coach, where this captious gentleman again made a stand, praying as a last favor, that he might be allowed to wait for the midnight tide, and thus escape the observation and ridicule of the crowd. The request was a natural one, and was civilly granted.

'It required four days, and nearly forty carriages, to transport the expelled Catholics to Dover. At first they appeared extremely

dogged and sullen, but the good fare, and kind entertainment, which everywhere awaited them on the road, and the natural vivacity of their country, gradually dispelled their feelings of disgust: still, the derision of the mob must have been any thing but agreeable. As Madame St. George was stepping into the boat at Dover, a bystander took an aim at her strange head-dress with a stone. An English gentleman, who was escorting her, instantly quitted her side, and running his sword through the offender's body, killed him on the spot.—*Ib.* pp. 76—82.

The following account of the sale of the king's pictures and coins must close our extracts.

‘The year before the death of Charles, his splendid effects, his unique cabinet, the delight of his leisure hours, were directed by the Parliament to be sold. Some ignorant individuals, who styled themselves commissioners, were appointed the appraisers. The inventory took a year in drawing up, and the collection three years in selling. The catalogue is preserved among the Harleian MSS., and is entitled, ‘An Inventory of the Goods, Jewels, Plate, &c., belonging to King Charles I., sold by order of the Council of State, from the year 1649 to 1652.’

‘Each article or lot had its price previously fixed, and nothing could exceed the gross barbarity and want of taste in the valuation. This Gothic insensibility and ignorance, however, mattered little; for except a slight occasional competition, the price given seldom exceeded the appraisement. It is curious to discover what in those days was considered the value of pictures, which are now deservedly regarded as beyond price. The celebrated cartoons of Raphael were valued at only £300, and what is more remarkable, were ‘knocked down’ without a purchaser. The six following pictures alone brought a price which could be considered as equivalent to their worth.

‘A Sleeping Venus, by Corregio, sold for 1,000*l.*

A Madonna, by Raphael, 2,000*l.*

A Picture, by Julio Romano, 500*l.*

A Madonna and Christ, by Raphael, 800*l.*

A Venus and Pard, by Titian, 600*l.*

‘The following have been mentioned as remarkable for the insignificant sums at which they were purchased.

‘The Woman taken in Adultery, by Rubens, 20*l.*

Peace and Plenty, by Rubens, 100*l.*

Venus attired by the Graces, 200*l.*

‘The Duke of Buckingham and his brother, one of the finest efforts of Vandyke, was valued at 30*l.*, and sold for 50*l.* Christ, the Virgin, and ‘many Angels dancing,’ by Vandyke, was only valued at

40*l*. Walpole informs us, that his father afterwards gave 700*l*. for this picture, and that it had been previously twice sold for upwards of 1,000*l*. Titian's pictures were generally appraised at 100*l*. But the valuation of the following list is really ludicrous.

‘King Edward III., with a great curtain before it, 4*l*.

A Portrait of Buchanan, 3*l*, 10*s*.

Queen Elizabeth, in her robes, 1*l*.

The Queen Mother, in mourning, 3*l*.

The King, when a Boy, 2*l*.

Picture of the Queen, when a child, 5*s*.

‘The valuable collection of coins sold, on the average, at about a shilling a-piece. The pictures, together with the furniture of *nineteen* palaces which had belonged to Charles, and the remains of the jewels and plate which had not already been sold for the maintenance of the royal cause, fetched the comparatively trifling sum of one hundred and eighteen thousand and eighty pounds, ten shillings and sixpence.’—*lb*. pp. 102—105.

The extracts we have given will inform our readers of the nature of the materials collected in these volumes. We must not, however, dismiss them, without a few animadversions from which we should gladly refrain, if truth and justice permitted it. The general complexion of Mr. Jesse's politics is very evident, nor do we complain of its being so. He has the common right of Englishmen to form his own opinions, and having done so, to give them utterance. But what shall we say of a writer largely conversant with our historical documents, who can sum up his description of Buckingham,—the haughty, reckless, and unprincipled favorite of two kings,—by telling us that ‘after perusing the history of his dazzling career, we shall perhaps doubt whether there is most room for envy or commiseration, for *applause* or *censure*.’ It is needless to comment on such language; we cite it only in proof of the little reliance which can be placed on our author's judgment. ‘The undeviating rectitude’ of Strafford is also as little known to history as Buckingham's title to *applause*; and if it be Mr. Jesse's intention, when contrasting the ‘brilliant qualities and open character’ of the Irish viceroy, with ‘the wily fanatics and mushroom politicians of the age of Charles,’ to refer to the leaders of the popular party, he only damages his own reputation, without injuring that of Pym, Hampden, and Vane. We smile at the absurd folly of a writer who, in the nineteenth century, can find no more appropriate term for John Pym than that of ‘demagogue,’ or who can describe the party with which he acted as ‘gloomy enthusiasts’ and ‘sanctimonious hypocrites.’ Such epithets, we regret to say, are scattered somewhat profusely through these volumes, and



they reflect no credit on the candor or discrimination of the author. It is of a piece with such caricaturing to represent Laud as, '*perhaps* no enemy to arbitrary measures,' and to tell us that his zeal '*almost* amounted to bigotry.'

But we have a more serious charge to urge. Puritanic in our notions, we are far from being pleased with the light and exculpatory manner in which, our author refers to the fashionable vices of his heroes. These, indeed, are only slightly noticed, but glossing terms are used, as though vice could be other than itself. The impression produced is bad, which we the more regret, as the professed character of the work lulls suspicion, and thus opens the youthful heart to the reception of impressions which, are hostile to the purity of its moral sentiments.

Our author's reference to the publication of the Book of Sports is in equally bad taste, to say nothing of the astounding ignorance it displays of the religious principles which were violated. We give the paragraph entire, lest our readers should deem our strictures too severe.

'One act of James's life can never be sufficiently commended. During the progresses made through his kingdom, he had noticed the pernicious effects which a puritanical observance of the Sabbath was producing on the health and happiness of the lower classes of his subjects. With the certainty that religious bigotry would be everywhere arrayed against him, he issued a proclamation, that, after the performance of divine service, his subjects should be allowed to indulge in all legitimate sports and amusements. Without entering into any theological discussion, as to the proper observance of the Lord's-day, there are few who will deny to James the real credit which he deserved on this occasion. Surely that monarch stands high among the thrones of the earth, who willingly turns from his own pomps and vanities, to the sufferings and discomforts of the poor and unprotected; and who readily encounters obloquy and discontent, in order to throw a gleam of sunshine over the broad shadows of human wretchedness.'

—Vol. i. pp. 111, 112.

The philosophy of this paragraph is as wretched as its religion, —the one is as shallow as the other is anti-scriptural. 'Mankind,' says Mr. Hallam, when referring to the republication of the Book of Sports in 1633, 'love sport as little as prayer by compulsion; and the immediate effect of the king's declaration was 'to produce a far more scrupulous abstinence from diversions on 'Sundays than had been practised before.'\* The testimony of May, one of the most dispassionate observers of the period in question, is most explicit on this point, for 'many men,' he in-

---

\* The Constitutional History of England, II. 78.

forms us, 'who had before been loose and careless, began upon 'that occasion to enter into a more serious consideration of it, and 'were ashamed to be invited, by the authority of Churchmen, to 'that which themselves, at the best, would but have pardoned in 'themselves, as a thing of infirmity. The example of the court 'where plays were usually presented on Sundays, did not so much 'draw the country to imitation, as reflect with disadvantage upon 'the court itself.\*

We leave Mr. Jesse to reconcile his eulogy with these facts, and shall be glad to find, in the event of his prosecuting further the design announced in his preface, that he has purged his style from some unworthy asperities, and imbibed a portion of the better spirit of those men whom, at present, he grossly libels, and is unable to comprehend. A candid mind swayed by deep reverence for the things of God, will lead him to regret having penned many sentences in these volumes.

---

Art. V. 1. *Chapters of the Modern History of British India.* By EDWARD THORNTON, Esq., Author of 'India, its State and Prospects.' 8vo. pp. 644. London: Allen and Co. 1840.

2. *Letters to and from the Government of Madras, relative to the Disturbances in Canara in April, 1837, with some Explanatory Notes; and a Letter to the Honorable Court of Directors of the East India Company.* By F. C. BROWN, Esq., of Tellicherry. 8vo. pp. 206. London: Smith and Elder. 1838.

3. *Notes on Indian Affairs.* By the Honorable FREDERICK JOHN SHORE, Judge of the Civil Court and Criminal Sessions of the District of Furrukhabad. 2 vols. 8vo. London: Parker.

4. *Edinburgh Review for January, 1840. Art. The Revenue System of British India.*

IT was thought a capital *jeu d'esprit* in Dr. Franklin when he was ambassador from the United States of America to France, and observed with surprise the late hours of the Parisians, to address a letter to them in one of the public journals, gravely assuring them that the sun at that time of the year actually rose at four o'clock in the morning, and that, therefore, there was no necessity for them to lie in bed till eleven and twelve, or to sit up so many hours by the light of lamps, which was so very inferior to sunshine: but it is something more than a joke that the people

---

\* History of the Long Parliament, p. 15.

of England should, at this time of day, have to be informed that they are actually in possession of India! Yet, this is the simple fact. The people of England have been for nearly a century in possession of some of the finest provinces of Hindustan; for these thirty years they have been in possession of the greater portion of the splendid peninsula of India, and yet to this day they do not know it. We say it advisedly, the people of England are ignorant that they are in possession of the most magnificent and important territory that ever became a dependency of another empire. It is true that we hear it said, and repeated in conversations and in print, that India belongs to England; and it is equally true that the East India Company, and a certain class of individuals who are brought up to look to India as the source of wealth and fortune, are well acquainted with the fact, but we repeat it solemnly, that the people of England, as a people, are totally ignorant that they hold so great a country, and have long held it in their hands. What! will any one pretend to tell us, that the people of England, a great, a wise, an enterprising, and philanthropic nation—a nation which is sending out its ships to explore every distant sea; its factors to open up commercial intercourse with every affluent coast, and its emigrants to found new states in every savage desert all the world over—that this great, wise, enterprising, and philanthropic people is aware that it holds at this moment, and has long held the vast regions of India, laying claim to them, indeed, as its particular feof—as lords and heritors of the soil—and yet makes comparatively little use of its advantages? Will it be believed for an instant, that we have there a mighty empire, in extent equal to three-fourths of all Europe,—an empire from the point of Cape Comorin to the Himalaya Mountains, offering every variety of climate, and every species of vegetable product; containing one hundred millions of people all willing and desirous to labor in cultivating that prolific soil, or in cooperating in one way or other to pour into this island the natural wealth of those regions, and to take the manufactures of England in exchange—and that the people of England can know this, and neglect this vast means of prosperity, and be indifferent to it? Will it be believed, that we are seeking everywhere for an outlet for our manufactured goods, and that while our artizans are starving by thousands and tens of thousands in the streets, and menacing in their hungry desperation the very existence of our government, we have in India a market capable of taking all the manufactured cottons and hardware goods that all our hands, and wheels, and hammers can furnish, let them be as busy as they may, provided that we will take the simplest common-sense means to have these hundred millions of fellow-subjects employed, and thus enabled to purchase them from us? Will it be believed, that instead of employing these hundred millions of fellow



subjects, we go to the Americans and the Portuguese, and to every slave-market that we can find for the very articles they can send us, by the slightest encouragement, three times cheaper? Will it be believed, that the plains of India are capable of growing the finest cotton in quantities to clothe the whole world; that there stand forests of trees capable of bleeding out India-rubber enough for all the purposes of the whole civilized world; that coffee, tea, sugar, corn, linseed, indigo, and a multitude of other rich products of a tropical climate, of the finest quality, at a price astonishingly low may be thence obtained; and that, with all this wealth offered to our hands, we choose rather that the people of England should be in unemployed distress, and the people of India should perish by famine, than that we should take one step towards setting them to work on both sides of the water, and making them happy and prosperous by their mutual labor?

But will it be believed, that far beyond this in absurdity, instead of employing our own subjects in the growth of cotton, we go to the slave-masters of America to purchase it at five times the price that these our suffering fellow-subjects could furnish it to us? That we thus starve our Indian people; destroy them as consumers of our manufactured articles, as well as growers of our raw cotton; raise the American slave-masters into our most formidable commercial rivals; have, in fact, thus created that navy of theirs which has made itself already so formidable, and all those busy merchant vessels of theirs which are to be found in all seas and all ports usurping our commerce and laughing at our stupidity? That sooner than employ our Indian people we now lend money to these American slave-masters to enable them to hold back cotton and enhance its price at their pleasure, and thus, by raising the cost of our fabrics, starve our artizans? Will it be believed, that while we have been laboring for nearly half a century to put down slavery and the slave-trade, and have paid fifty millions to destroy the slave-trade, and twenty millions at one time to purchase the freedom of the slaves in our own West-Indian islands, we still purchase our cottons and other articles from the slave-holders, and have thus encouraged slavery and the slave-trade to that degree, that more slaves are now annually taken from Africa than ever, while all this time our millions and millions of Indian subjects are standing ready to grow us cotton, sugar, and every article of slave-manufacture at a far less cost, and are even perishing for want of that employment by half a million at a time? That, in short, we are actually laboring and paying with one hand every day of our lives to extinguish slavery, and with the other keeping alive slavery by purchasing of the slave-master the products of slavery? That we at one and the same moment are starving our free fellow-subjects and enriching the slave-master: condemning slavery as diabolical, and perpetu-

ating it at the expense of our Indian territories, our navy and our commerce? Will it be believed, that we, who are the greatest philanthropists in the world, can know that our Indian people are crushed to the dust by poverty and exaction, and that we take no single step to amend the condition of such vast numbers of human beings under our control? That we who pride ourselves on our commercial and political shrewdness, should know that our Indian empire is a mine of wealth exhaustless, overflowing, and inconceivable, if properly worked, and that we will not so work it, but suffer its resources every day to diminish, and its revenue to sink before our eyes? We say, will it be believed that we know all this and suffer it?

No! no fact is more manifest than that the people of England do not know that India is theirs, or they would know that they held in their hand a talisman by which they could accomplish three of the most stupendous achievements that ever were put into the power of man—remove famine, and the lowest degradation from the millions of India, annihilate slavery at a blow all over the world, and convert the starvation of our spinners and weavers into active labor and fulness of bread—pouring into the heart of England wealth and political and Christian influence in such a stream as with all our energies and greatness, neither she nor any other nation has yet known!

Our language may seem to many the madness of romance; but we shall find no difficulty in proving to the satisfaction of the most matter-of-fact readers, that it is nothing but the soberest reality. Nay, it is to matter-of-fact men that we desire particularly to address ourselves, for it is not on dreams and fancies but on stern yet astonishing facts that we take our stand. So far from ours being the madness of romance in this case, when the subject comes to be fairly understood—when England, indeed, comes to know that she really possesses India, it will then appear to the public, that we have been for half a century laboring under the madness of wilfully shutting our eyes to the circumstance that India was ours: and that we had in it the means to place us at the head of all the civilizers and harmonizers of the world. We did not, as a people, know what we possessed in India—therefore India has become miserable, and a few individuals only here have become enriched by her instead of the nation.

If we are asked how this has come to pass, we answer by our being first engaged in long wars, and then in the domestic embarrassments into which they had introduced us. We were too busy with continental or party warfare to attend to our own affairs, and we deputed the rule of this great eastern empire to a company, and let it slip aside from our observation.

If any one thinks otherwise, let him go to-morrow into society, and ask the best informed people that he can find what they know

of the real condition of British India; or let him ask any member of parliament what attention Indian questions obtain in the House of Commons. The first will tell you that they know nothing, but that they hear that India is a rich country. The other will shrug his shoulders and say, 'Oh, nobody troubles himself about things so far off.' Besides this apathy and this ignorance, which mutually strengthen each other, there are those who have an interest in keeping up delusions on the subject, and we see such delusions industriously propagated every day. We shall in this article endeavor to strip away some of the most recent and most interested of these delusions, and let in some light on this truly great subject, in which our fate as a nation, and our honor as a Christian nation are more deeply concerned than our countrymen are generally aware of. Indeed, since we have been led to look carefully into it, we have been compelled to regard our possession of this splendid empire of India with all its wealth and resources, and our neglect of it, and ignorant casting away of the affluence with which it has been, and is yet capable of crowning us, as the most singular phenomenon in history, and as the most gross instance of blindness that ever fell on a nation of active, ambitious, intelligent, and benevolent men.

In the work placed first on the list at the head of this article, we are told that 'India has yet to boast of being incomparably 'the best governed of the dependent possessions of Great Britain.'—p. 603.

We wish most earnestly that that were true! We would most gladly be convinced of so comfortable a fact. It would melt away from our bosoms a dreary weight of care which now lies there. But if it be the fact, that 'India is incomparably the best governed 'of the dependent possessions of Great Britain,' either we are misinformed, or the condition of the worst governed must be deplorable indeed. If India be well governed, then it must be a prosperous and a happy country, for a well governed people all the world over, and in every age of the world have been, and are, a happy people. It is a vast country, a naturally fertile country. It has been, whatever it be now, a country wealthy to a proverb. The wealth of the Indies, the mines of Golconda, the pearls, and spices, and silken fabrics of India, have been in all past ages, the very words used to express every species of affluence and splendor; and, therefore, if India be a well-governed country, it is a wealthy and a prosperous country still. It would be a practical absurdity; it would be an outrage upon all language and all common sense to assert that India was a wealthy country when it fell into our hands; that it has all these years been well-governed by us, and yet now is poor, and its people miserable. But that it is poor, and its people miserable, we shall show upon the very highest authorities. Here is Mr. Thornton, a clerk to



the Court of Directors, who has never been in India at all, and who yet coolly undertakes to tell the public, that 'India is incomparably the best governed of all our dependent possessions;' but the highest and most unexceptionable authorities,—gentlemen who have stood high in office and moral character in India itself; who have served there for many years, tell, as we shall show, a very different story: and even the *Edinburgh Review* of the other day, in an article written expressly to vindicate and perpetuate the present state of things in India, confirms most unequivocally this statement. What sort of process of good government then is this, by which a great, a populous, and wealthy country is reduced to the condition of an annually falling revenue, and to the most frightful popular misery?

Of the actual condition of British India at this moment we are in possession of a mass of evidence which would fill not this review merely, but a whole series of copious volumes. The subject is so vast that we must at this time necessarily confine ourselves to a small fraction of it, but such is its vital importance to the public, that we pledge ourselves to revert to it again and again, if the cause of truth and humanity call for it at our hands. For the present, let us produce evidence enough to see whether or not Mr. Thornton's position is tenable.

A well governed country is filled with a numerous and a happy people. Its fields are in a high state of culture, and are highly productive. It has a simple, clear, just, and effective system of judicature. Its various classes of population are well and wisely knit together into a constitution of social strength. It has a rich revenue, and is not ground by fiscal exactions. Its roads, and other public works attest the watchfulness and paternal providence of the government, always seeking to increase the convenience of the people, and the beauty and dignity of the general aspect of the country and its cities. The functions of trade and agriculture move freely, unvexed with monopolies and galling transit duties. Education is, of course, promoted; and the personal and religious feelings of the people are carefully respected. These are some of the main features of a well governed country, and we ask those who are best acquainted with British India whether they are the features of that country?

The natives of British India are no doubt a numerous people, for they are estimated at upwards of one hundred millions; but large as is this amount, it is trivial to what an eastern population would be under a good government. China even, which is little more than of double the extent, contains four times the population. These hundred millions of British India occupy a territory of five hundred thousand square miles, and it is calculated by those well acquainted with the country, that more than one third of it lies waste and uninhabited. But how is it that in the best

governed of all our dependencies, we have all this waste and desolation? We shall not wonder when we have looked a little into the mysteries of this good government. What says the Honorable Frederick John Shore on this subject? This gentleman, the brother of Lord Teignmouth, was, for more than fifteen years, resident in India. He filled various offices in the police, revenue, and judicial departments of the country, the last being Judge of the Civil Court and Criminal Sessions of Furrukhabad. In every one of these he was highly respected by all classes of men, native and English. He is since deceased, leaving behind him a character for uprightness, intimate acquaintance with the condition of India, general intelligence, and benevolence of disposition which have made his memory revered both in that country and this. His statements no one has dared to call in question; nay, the very writer in the *Edinburgh Review* quotes him as unexceptionable authority. We shall, therefore, make large use of his evidence, supporting it by that of various other high authorities to the extent that our space will permit.

Here, then, are some of Mr. Shore's notions of the excellency of our government, and of the happiness produced by it. He tells us that he went to India with the most settled conviction of the blessing which our sway was to the Indian people; but he had not been long there before very different and disagreeable impressions were forced upon him. He looked in vain for that scene of wealth and prosperity, which he had always been told that India was under our auspices. 'I perceived,' he says, 'a strong feeling of disaffection towards the English government, and a dislike to the English themselves as a nation.' Inquiring carefully into the real cause of this, he found that 'Well-founded complaints of oppression and extortion on the part of both government and individuals, were innumerable.' Asking why, with all our high professions, such evils were not redressed, he was told that it was impossible under the present system—the system, be it understood, in full operation at this moment. Mr. Shore's work was published here only in 1837. With all the concern of an honorable mind, Mr. Shore pursued the inquiry thus opened to him into the principles and practice of the British Indian administration; and soon, he says, found himself at no loss to comprehend the feelings of the people both towards our government and ourselves. He then says—

'It would have been astonishing, indeed, had it been otherwise. The fundamental principle of the English had been to make the whole Indian nation subservient in every possible way to the interests and benefits of themselves. They had been taxed to the utmost limit; every successive province, as it fell into our hands, had been made a field for higher exaction; and it has always been our boast how greatly

we have raised the revenue above that which the native rulers were able to extort. The Indians have been excluded from every honor, dignity, or office which the lowest Englishman could be prevailed upon to accept; while our public offices, and, as we have been pleased to call them, courts of justice, have been sinks of every species of villany, fraud, chicane, oppression, and injustice, to such an extent that men who have been robbed of their property, and whose relations have been murdered, will often pay large sums to the police to prevent investigation from the dread of being compelled to attend one of our courts, even in the character of a prosecutor or witness.'—Vol. ii. pp. 518, 519.

That we think, is a pretty comprehensive sentence to begin with in an authority which is quoted as authority by a writer in the *Edinburgh Review* in defence of a system which is at this moment in operation; but we beg our readers to understand that this is but one passage out of two large octavo volumes of the most astonishing details of our oppressions, rapacity, cruelty, haughtiness, and iron insensibility to the miseries which for more than half a century we have heaped on one of the most ancient, refined, and inoffensive nations in the world.

'The summary,' continues Mr. Shore, 'is, that the British-Indian government has been practically, one of the most extortionate and oppressive that ever existed in India; one under which injustice has been and may be committed, both by the government and by individuals, provided the latter be rich, to an almost unlimited extent, *and under which redress from injury is almost unattainable; the consequence of which is that we are abhorred by the people*, who would hail with joy, and instantly join the standard of any power whom they thought strong enough to occasion our downfall. . . . How is it possible, after the treatment they have received, that our government, or ourselves, should be popular with them? And yet we are pleased to assert that they rejoice in a government by which they are trodden to the dust, and oppressed *more than by any of their foreign rulers.*'  
—Vol. ii. pp. 521, 522.

This does not augur much for good government and a happy people: but what is this treatment of the natives by us which Mr. Shore says has made us so much detested? Simply that England has fastened on India as a vampire fastens on its living victim, and that its sole, ceaseless, and remorseless business has been to drink its life-blood, and drain its strength, to the last stage of exhaustion, in the shape of gold. For this sole purpose our conquests have been made; and a dreadful history is the history of those conquests,—a dreadful history of every fraud, every violence, every crime which can shock and disgrace humanity. For this all our regulations have been framed. The grand object was gain, and patronage by which fortunes could be



put into the hands of the children and connexions of the proprietors. For this, till lately, India was hermetically sealed to all Englishmen but such as were in the service of the Company. Those who went into that service went to gather all they could, and as there were no witnesses to their extortions and oppressions but those who were implicated in them, India became a hell, in which Englishmen, brought up as gentleman, and calling themselves Christians, were the perpetual fiends and tormentors. Things were so arranged that these should not settle in the country lest they should stand in the way of fresh adventurers, and decrease the patronage and obstruct the insatiable cupidity at home. All the natives were excluded from office for the same purpose, and were obliged to stand and see their country plundered before their faces, and its enormous ancient wealth carried off to England by a never-ceasing, ever-changing race of harpies. Nay, the half-castes, children of Englishmen by Indian mothers, were by their unnatural fathers cut off also from all offices of trust and emolument in their native land for the same purpose, and while these white fathers returned to England to establish fresh families, and enjoy in luxury and splendor, the produce of Indian exactions, these, their children were left to become objects of marked contempt, insult, and injustice in the land of their birth.

Can a more dreadful fact be laid open to the eyes of the English public than that this has been the great and only object of our conquering and holding that vast and fine country? That it has not been to extend to it the benefits of a good government; to civilize, to cultivate, to raise it in the scale of nations, and to confer on it in exchange for its wealth the blessings we as a great Christian and enlightened nation enjoy; but wholly, and from year to year, to drain and wring from it by every means of power and fraud, its gold, its fertility, and the very life-blood of the people? Yet, the whole of Mr. Shore's volumes demonstrate this dreadful truth, and no other; and not only the works of Shore, but of every other writer of character who has ventured to tell what he knew of India. What say Mr. Thornton and the *Edinburgh Review* to this? They will find it a vain attempt any longer to blind the English public to the real state of the case; and it is lamentable to see the *Edinburgh Review*, which should be the advocate of political justice and all necessary reforms, lending its pages to the humiliating purpose of throwing dust in the eyes of the English nation on a subject which, perhaps, more than all others involves the national interests, as it certainly does its character for honor and humanity. The motto of the *Edinburgh Review* is a fine motto—'Judex damnatur cum nocens absolvitur,' but the editor has a son in the India House, and nothing blinds the 'Judex' so much as interest. This fact,

however, and another of equal moment, that the article in question is pretty well known to be written, on behalf of the India House, by the very man at whose (chief) suggestion they have attempted the iniquitous 'Land resumption' of Bengal, it is only proper the public should be made aware of in order to estimate the advocacy of the Edinburgh, in this case, at its true value.

'There can be little pleasure,' says Mr. Shore, 'in detracting from one's own countrymen and associates, but no man, thinking and feeling as I have done, could remain silent, unless his sense of duty were blunted; no man could contemplate the immense mass of misery and ruin which will infallibly result from the infatuation in which we are enveloped relative to the nature of the British-Indian government and our tenure in this country, without lifting up his hand or his pen to avert, if possible, such awful consequences.'—*Ib.* p. 525.

Such feelings and such awful consequences, however, it seems that the clerk of the East India Company and the writer in the *Edinburgh Review* equally set at defiance, so that they can continue a little longer to saddle India with the present system of plunder and atrocity.

But that we may not appear to be giving our own views of the government of India, we shall endeavor, as far as possible, to confine ourselves to the words of our authorities. Mr. Shore says,

'The chief object of British administration in this country, ever since its establishment, would appear to have been that of the exaltation of the few upon the oppression of the many; that is, that the whole population of India should, by every possible means, be rendered subservient to their English rulers, and contribute exclusively to their benefit. . . . The attention of the Company has been directed in true mercantile spirit, to realize as large a profit as possible on the capital embarked. The method of obtaining this was to monopolize every branch of trade that could be made productive to themselves, and to employ the least number of laborers, at the lowest rate of wages. For this purpose it was, of course, politic to send as few servants to India as could possibly manage their concerns; to prevent their making any permanent settlement there, and to throw every impediment in the way of all other Europeans who wished to visit the country from any motives. The instructions issued by the Court of Directors to their servants have been a continued theme to make large remittances home, and so long as these instructions were fulfilled, little inquiry was instituted as to the means by which they were obtained.'

—*Vol. i.* pp. 114, 115.

In the prosecution of this object, the Company proceeded to seize not merely on the government of the country, but on the land itself. They set up the most undisguised claim to the whole

property of the land. They dispossessed all classes of landowners, from the prince to the peasant, of their estates, and put them under such regulations and officers for collecting the rent, as they pleased. They became, at once, the universal proprietors and landlords. In the lower provinces of Bengal, Lord Cornwallis in 1793, made what is called The Permanent Settlement, establishing what is termed the Zemindary system; that is, conferring on a certain class of persons the title of Zemindars, or general collectors, and fixing the certain amount of rent, or land-tax, for in India they mean the same thing, which each should pay to government, and leaving them to appoint sub-collectors, and extract what they pleased from the *ryots*, or cultivators. This is considered the most favorable system in the country, though in this, government has taken no pains to secure the cultivators from the arbitrary exactions of these Zemindars. But a great portion of British India is under what is called the Ryotwarry system; that is, the whole country is divided into portions of a few acres, on which a ryot is placed, and surveyors and collectors of the land-tax, or government rent, are placed over them, to receive the amount of exaction which the government pleases to make, which is reckoned at one half of the whole gross produce of the land. But as this is levied by a money value, and is fixed before the crop is ripe, or the market value is determined by the circumstances of the season, it now frequently amounts to six-eighths of the whole, and if it turns out a year of scarcity, often to the whole and even to more than the whole value of the crop. The principle of government has always been to levy the very highest amount that they can, even, as expressly recommended by Sir Thomas Monro, if it does not leave the miserable ryot seed for another year, or food even for his family. The surveyor comes round every year, and puts a value upon every thing possible, even on young trees that are just planted, and which will not yield a farthing of profit for years to come. Nay, as Mr. Shore tells us, it being the direct interest of the collectors to establish their characters with the government as 'crack collectors,' and 'first-rate collectors,' their only way to do this is by extorting all they possibly can from the people, for in exact proportion with the sum they return to government does their character with it fall or rise, and their way to higher offices is opened or closed. Besides, as no court of justice will listen to complaints against collectors, that being the way to check collection, and as not only are the collectors policemen, but the magistrates also are collectors, redress is as much out of the reach of those who are fleeced as if they had to go up to the moon for it. Thus not only are the tax-gatherers encouraged to raise all the revenue they possibly can by whatever means, but are tempted to every species of individual bribery and extortion for their own benefit.



It may easily be imagined what has been the effect of such a system. It has been to reduce the whole population of this vast empire to a state of pauperism. It has annihilated every thing like the substantial farmer, or the accumulation of capital. John F. Thomas, Esq., of the Madras Civil Service, in 'Notes on Ryotwar, or permanent annual money rents in South India; and on the Duty of Government in periods of Famine,' published in 'The Madras Journal of Literature and Science,' of January to March, 1839, a paper which every one who would wish to inform himself of the naturally destructive nature of this system should read, gives us a table by which it is shown that in three villages alone in Coimbatore, there was a regular sinking between 1816 and 1831, of the farms into small pauper tenancies, the more substantial ryots sinking during that period in those three villages alone from 78 to 28. The celebrated Bramin, Rammohun Roy, in his 'Exposition of the operation of the Judicial and Revenue Systems of India,' says, 'under both systems, the condition of the cultivator is very miserable; in the one, they are placed at the mercy of the *Zemindars*' avarice and ambition; in the other, they are subjected to the extortions and intrigues of the surveyors and other government revenue officers. I deeply compassionate both.'—p. 69. This system has tended to prevent all improvement, even to the keeping up of planting of trees necessary for fruit, or for protecting the soil from the burning sun of India. It has left the whole population of the country at the mercy of a single bad season; the drought has come—the ryot has had no stock of corn or rice—a famine has swept through the country, carrying off its thousands and tens of thousands at once.

Such is the present state of India;—is that a well-governed country? The Edinburgh Review tells us that the land is the best and almost sole source of revenue in India. We grant that it is so now, for the government, by thus destroying the vitals of the country, and trampling on the nascent germs of accumulation of capital in it, has taken away almost every other legitimate source of revenue. He tells us too, that this state of things is unavoidable; that wherever the country is divided into a number of small tenancies, there is a disposition to an excess of population, and to a competition for labor which occasions one vast extent of poverty. He bids us look at Ireland for another proof. A more unhappy allusion could not possibly be made. Ireland and British India are exactly parallel instances of countries in which the land is in the hands of great absentee proprietors, and which is divided into such minute occupancies, that no individual can accumulate capital, and where, in consequence, all become wretched in the extreme. So strikingly alike are the circumstances of the two countries, that Howitt, in his 'Coloni-

'zation and Christianity,' has styled British India 'THE IRELAND 'OF THE EAST.' The Reviewer proceeds to tell us that this cannot be avoided, and that it is useless in government to leave any thing more than a bare subsistence in the hands of the cultivators, because if they do, it will only be taken from them by others, and will be equally lost to the poor ryot. This is certainly the most curious system of political economy that this economical age in its heartlessness has spawned. We ask the reviewer who has thrown the country into these wretched allotments; and whether that government which has altered every single tenure in all India, and dispossessed every man at their pleasure, has not the power to throw the land into larger divisions, and to frame such regulations as shall allow the cultivators gradually to accumulate capital, and thus increase the wealth of the state? If he knows any thing of India, he knows that even under the defective permanent settlement of Bengal, the value of property and the amount of revenue has greatly increased; while under this wretched Ryotwar system, both have greatly decreased; nay, that they are at this time steadily decreasing, so much so that while in 1826, the land-tax amounted to sixteen millions, in 1836 it had fallen to about eleven millions, a loss of five millions in ten years, a steady decline of half a million annually which still goes on.\*

The Reviewer's system, in fact, amounts simply to this; that the way to govern a country well, is to divide it into such insignificant portions that it is impossible that you can have cultivators of capital and intelligence; and that the more you fleece a man the better he is for it. That you must not only pick a man's pocket, but pick it of all that is in it, and do it continually, in order to protect him from the rapacity of others, or his own want of sense. We should like to see the Reviewer propound this sage system of his to the jolly farmers of this country, who like to have a well-stocked farm, a good table, a good horse, a good surplus to leave amongst their children, and a purse always prepared to pay those liberal taxes to government which can never be wrung from the lowest swarms of poverty.

But the Reviewer also complains of the famines of India being charged to the government; protests that they are the result of natural causes; and asks very pathetically whether the government can demand rain from heaven? That the famines

---

\* 'This country is becoming too expensive to govern, and, at the rapid rate at which the inhabitants are being destroyed, and the resources annihilated, the British power and government, must, ere long, withdraw from the force of circumstances, that is, from the actual *bona fide* want of the means to support their power. It is an indisputed fact, however much the people may be deceived by figured statements, that the revenues are yearly decreasing.  
—*Extract of a Letter from an Eminent Native in India, dated Oct. 12, 1839.*

of India are the results of natural causes we fully admit, for there can be no greater natural causes of sterility, dearth, and consequent destruction of human life than bad government, bad institutions, and rapacious exactions, leaving behind them abject poverty, and impossibility of provision. Periodical droughts, there are unquestionably, but periodical droughts, under a wise and paternal government, need produce no famine, especially in a country like India, which produces two or three crops a year, and under good management so abundantly, as to be capable of producing in one year food for the whole population for three. It is notorious, that in every Indian famine upon record, there has been no actual want of grain in the country. If there has been a total failure in one district, there has been plenty of grain in others; nay, in some of the great famines there has been going on exportation of vast quantities of corn and rice at the very time that the people were perishing. During the great famine of Agra, in 1838, one of the most horrible famines in history, and the dreadful details of which Englishmen should read if they would know what curses this Christian nation can inflict on its dependent and conquered people; during this famine of yesterday, in which half a million of natives perished before the eyes of their English masters in every shape of horror and self-devouring phrenzy, no less a quantity than 165,646,104lbs. of rice and other edible grain, were exported, as is shown by the reports of the India House itself!

We could, had we space, show some fearful facts connected with these famines; such as the doctrine of the British Indian government, that in a drought the only plan is to make grain so dear, that the people can only purchase a little at a time, and therefore will not entirely exhaust it; on which ground they have proceeded themselves to aggravate dreadfully the scarcity by buying up the grain, and laying it up in warehouses. The Reviewer contends, that in the awful famine of Agra, in 1838, government did all that a government could do, to assist the perishing people, by giving out grain to a large amount. We admit that government did this—but it did it when it was too late. It did it when numbers were too much exhausted to crawl to the depôts. It did it, too, only at the last hour, and when the cry of public agony and public indignation was too desperate to be longer neglected. The simple fact, that government had grain, and suffered half a million of people to perish, is too damnatory to admit of exculpation. We ask the Reviewer, whether the government, well aware of these occasional droughts, has ever done any thing to provide against their arrival? Has it, out of the teeming crops of India, left enough in the hands of the growers to enable them, and little will do it, to live through such a season? Has it left them substance enough to purchase food? Or has it laid up, like Joseph in Egypt, corn in store to



deal out at the moment of need, and before the poor wretches, who toil for it, already weakened by excessive labor and miserable fare, sink in exhaustion? We tell him, nay! but, on the contrary, it has, by its rapacity, cruel as death, and insatiable as the grave, aggravated, and to a certain degree, created the very causes of those famines. In the first place, it has devoured the substance, and sapped the strength of the population. In the next place, it has by its taxing every young fruit tree that the cultivators might put into the ground, contributed greatly to denude the country, and expose its soil to its vertical sun. If we had answered the Reviewer's appeal, 'whether the government could demand rain from heaven?' by a plain yes! however much it might astonish him, it would be a more philosophical answer than he seems to be aware of. Most people now know that one of the most remarkable properties of trees, and especially masses of trees, is to attract moisture from the atmosphere, and occasion rain—a fact long ago pointed out by Evelyn in his *Sylva*. The Pasha of Egypt, has, by merely planting produced rain, with thunder and lightning, in that country, where they were never before known through all history. We may even say then, that the ruthless exactions of the Indian government have tended to produce the droughts as well as the famines. It has done this in more ways than one. The tanks which the ancient lords of the country had made to irrigate it, our government has suffered to fall into decay—a great and positive cause of drought and famine. Further, it has suffered the roads to go to decay, and has not caused others to be made, so that actually when the inhabitants of one district have been perishing of famine, the next district has had plenty of grain without a possibility of sending it to the rescue of the dying. The Reviewer then instead of throwing the onus upon Heaven, should have shown that the government had used those human means which any wise and good government has in its power to provide against a known evil; especially a government like that of India, which is every year extorting from these wretched people a revenue of **TWENTY MILLIONS STERLING!**

But we must give further warrant for our opinion of the Indian government. Mr. Shore says,—

'In the reports of Government sent home, the flourishing state of the country under the excellence of the British administration, has hitherto always formed a prominent topic; and any proceeding which should in any way tend to lower the credit of those favorable accounts, is not likely to raise the person who brings it forward in the estimation of the Government.'—Vol. i. p. 134.

Nay, he adds elsewhere, that such honest speaking would speedily cause his deportation from India. Of the natives, he says—

‘Placed by the chances of war, or negotiations in which they had no share, under our authority, they have been ruled by a system whose primary principle was self-interest and self-exaltation. They have witnessed, year by year, the gradual decay of their power, their dignity, and their wealth; the ruin of their princes and governors, and the daily increasing poverty of the whole people, caused by the rapacity and mismanagement of their governors. They have suffered by being excluded from every office which it was possible to bestow upon Englishmen; they have seen the abolition of almost every hereditary institution by which the affairs of the country were formerly administered; and have been mocked by a harrassing and vexatious system of *miscalled* justice, infinitely more expensive, and less efficient than their own, under which oppression and injustice have pervaded their land. This, in a few words, is the summary of their obligations to the British Government.’—*Ib.*, pp. 146, 147.

Volumes have been written on the Ryotwar system. We can here only state its general features.

‘A ryotwar settlement,’ says Mr. Shore, ‘is what? Divested of its mystification it is simply this;—to get rid of the principal farmers for the different estates, who, of course, reap some little profit for their trouble and risk in the management of them, and by making the settlement directly with the subordinate owners and cultivators, to realize for government the share which the principal farmer formerly received. Disguised as it may be under fair-sounding names, this is the principle of a ryotwar settlement. . . . The land is, for the most part, subdivided into portions of three or four fields, each of which is cultivated by men who possess their own plough and cattle, and who manage their own portion according to their own pleasure, as long as they pay their quota of rent. Almost without exception, the poverty of these men is so great, that, without periodical advances of cash and grain for every crop, their operations would be stopped, and should one of their bullocks die, they must borrow money to buy another. As to any improvements, such as sinking wells, cutting canals, &c., all prospect of such is annihilated, no individual cultivator can afford it.’—pp. 184—186.

‘We impose taxation to such a pitch on the main source of wealth, the land, that in an ordinary season the proprietors and farmers have only just sufficient left them to subsist on; and when a scarcity does occur, not until the household goods have been sold for arrears, and the people begin to think of emigrating to the native states, so that the impossibility of realizing the balance is forced upon them, will government ever consent to any remission. *This it is which makes a scarcity felt far more in our provinces than in any native state.* At this moment, thousands of all classes, ages, and sexes, are wandering about in a state of nakedness and destitution almost inconceivable. They are even giving their children away to any one who will promise to feed them and keep them as servants.’—p. 438.

‘To count the fruit-trees and cattle of the villagers, in the hope of discovering some additional fund of taxation! Heaven help the miserable cultivators! There is little chance of their being looked upon with an eye of pity by the British Indian Government.’—p. 436.

So little, that Rammohun Roy tells us, that after selling up the stock and furniture of the wretched creatures, they arrest and throw into prison their persons, to which incarceration there is no limit fixed by law. See his 'Exposition,' p. 76.

Such, Englishmen, is the condition of the bulk of the millions of Hindustan, under your enlightened East India Company! Such is the beautiful system which they have invented and established for the purpose of wringing revenue from abject and skeleton hands, which would have flowed in a hundred-fold stream from a liberal and just administration. Such is the condition of your Indian fellow-subjects at this instant. Always on the verge of starvation: always in ignorance and misery: always slaves in the truest sense of the word; and every season in danger of falling into a direful famine—now the only blessing left them—for it sweeps them, by half a million at a time, out of our grinding clutches, and sends them to the mercies of our common God and Father! Such is the state of things which we are called upon to admire and perpetuate by the *Edinburgh Review*; and such is that country which a clerk of the Court of Directors, declares to be 'the best governed of all our dependencies!'

This, however, is but one feature out of a thousand which the oppression of British India assumes. The whole system is put together as if it were designed to exhibit to mankind how far human ingenuity could go in framing a scheme of government, by which the gracious laws of Providence, the bounties of nature, and the industry of man, can be most completely thwarted, stultified, and converted into an absurdity and a curse! The one great source of Indian revenue is this land-tax, which a hundred millions of most wretched beings are perpetually employed in scraping up under the harrassing exactions of a host of tax-gatherers, and which yet, so far have we consumed the very vitals of this once rich country, after all, amounts to only five shillings per head, while the population of our other dependencies pay to government from 30s. to 77s. per head!

The next, and almost only other source of revenue, is from monopoly. Not content with having thus outraged nature, and every principle of progression and improvement by the establishment of this barbarous system of agriculture, the government has based its other sources of profit on the most monstrous of the monstrosities of monopoly, chiefly of opium and salt. Nothing can be contrived more absurdly ingenious for the insult and gross injury of a whole people than the monopoly of salt. The people are a vegetable-eating people, and cannot live without salt, and the government make this use of this knowledge. Here lies the rich district of Bengal, producing corn and rice in abundance, and but little salt; there lies in juxtaposition the comparatively sterile district of Madras, growing little corn, but abounding in



salt. Nature seems to have pointed out to the dullest eye, the grand principle of beneficent exchange, but the government, like Mephistophiles, steps in with uplifted finger, and cries, 'Mark ! 'no corn shall pass from Bengal, nor salt from Madras, except 'under the 500 per cent. taxation of our monopoly.' Nature throws up beautiful salt from the sea on the shores of India, but government forbids any inhabitant, even on his own land, gathering it under a penalty of £50, and three months' imprisonment. It is all seized by government, and doled out at such prices as to create a revenue of £2,500,000 per annum.

The iniquities of the Opium trade we have already introduced to our readers. The seat and origin of the trade are here on the plains of India. The growth and sale of that pestilential drug, are another of the monstrous monopolies of the Indian government. As if possessed by some principle of gigantic evil, that government, eschewing all sources of healthful commerce, seizes with a morbid avidity on what is most pregnant with plagues and calamities. Knowing, with a calm consciousness, all the horrors which opium inflicts on the Chinese, the government not only curses them with it, but makes its growth a curse also to the people of India. The poppy is planted amid curses, its produce is purchased with extortion, carried forth with violence, and sold to work the physical and moral ruin of millions. On the finest corn lands of Benares, Behar, and part of Bengal, the inhabitants are compelled to grow opium, and opium alone; and it speedily exhausts the soil. The opium being manufactured, the Company takes it all, giving the growers such a price as it pleases; and what proportion that is of its real value may be seen from this fact, attested by the returns of the India House. When the Company in 1822, was obtaining 60s. per lb. for its opium, at its sales at Calcutta, it was giving its wretched cultivators 2s. per lb. ! Its estimated profit on opium has for the last ten years been one million a year; and the value of its opium exported to China, in 1839, was £2,700,926. Such is the trading conscience of the East India Company; but there is a fact connected with their opium growing at this moment peculiarly alarming. We are assured by a paper read by C. A. Bruce, Esq., in September last, before the Agricultural and Horticultural Society of India, that the growth of opium in Assam, is attended with such circumstances, that unless the British government prohibit it, we shall never receive much tea thence, so fast is it usurping the best corn lands, and its use destroying the health and morals of the people.

From what we have already quoted, it may be seen how beautifully governed are our Indian territories. But we go further, and declare that, according to our English ideas of property, there is no such thing as private property under the government

of the East India Company. For proof of this, we refer to Shore's chapter on the Purveyance and Forced Labor System, vol. i. p. 307. The writer in the *Edinburgh Review*, accuses Mr. Thompson, the travelling secretary of the British India Society, of having quoted the only passage in Bishop Heber's *Journal*, unfavorable to the Government of the East India Company. We could point out to the writer, had we space, some dozens of passages in the journal of that upright man, quite as unfavorable as that. We may do it another time; but for the present we will only refer to vol. i. pp. 155, 185, 341, 356, 432; vol. iii. p. 336 of his journal, and give these two passages. 'Fishing boats were very unwilling to come near us; on being hailed, paddled off with all speed.'—Third edition, vol. i. p. 154. At page 209 he tells us, that wanting twenty men to drag his boats, he sent to a village; but, as soon as his messengers were seen approaching, all the villagers fled away, supposing it was a requisition for government service, and for which, as usual, they would never get paid; as soon, however, as they understood who it was, they came with alacrity, and these twenty men dragged his boats all day and till nine at night, when they were dismissed, highly satisfied with two rupees, or four shillings amongst them!

When the notorious Warren Hastings was travelling from Calcutta to Lahore, he was astonished to see the people similarly flying at his approach, shutting up their shops, and escaping to the woods. No doubt that has been the case in India from that time to the present; and why is this in a well governed country? Mr. Shore lets us into the whole mystery in his chapter on Forced Labor and Purveyance. 'In procuring supplies for camps, carriage for troops, or for the civil functionaries; provisions for the gaols; tools for the convicts; trains of workmen, either for government or for private individuals; purchase of cattle and sheep for the food of the European soldiers, in short, in almost every possible way, they carry this baneful system into full operation, to the disgrace of the government and its officers, and the intolerable oppression of the people.' That is, out rush the myrmidons of the government or of private individuals, and seize cattle, pack-horses, camels, sheep, carts, whatever they need, wherever found. They have butchers with whom they make contracts, and these men send out a troop of fellows distinguished by government badges, to seize sheep or cattle on any man's ground; they paying the plunderers a certain portion of the government price, and keeping a good per centage themselves. They seize all flocks of sheep which they can find; particularly breeding ewes, which they threaten to carry off in order to extort money for their release. They perpetrate every species of oppression, or in plain language, plunder the country like an invading army. They go upon lands which have been sown and

cultivated for ages on pretence of finding *unclaimed trees* to make handles for the tools of government workmen—it serves them for a means of extracting a bribe to save the trees. They seize, on highways and at fairs, on horses and men to carry goods, often throwing out loads of the goods of merchants on the roads, and taking away their vehicles. The public treasures, materials for building police station-houses, every thing, in fact, which government or great men want conveying, are thus supplied with men and carriages. ‘As soon, therefore,’ says Shore, ‘as the people perceive the *cortège* approaching, accompanied by a police-officer, they run and hide themselves. You may see sometimes half a village scampering over the fields, pursued by one or more police officers in full hue and cry.’ Is not this a beautifully governed country? ‘Oh!’ says the Honorable Mr. Shore, ‘that we had a Cruickshank to illustrate this and other scenes consequent on the Purveyance system of the British Indian government!’

But our indignant readers will say, is there no law—no redress for such abominable outrages? No! if there were redress there could no longer be the outrages. There can be said to be no law at all for the multitude. There are courts of justice, so called, but on that curious system of the *reductio ad absurdum* which is the practice throughout our Indian states. They are constructed on this plan. There is one magistrate to a district as large as Yorkshire; so that do the best he may, it is impossible that he can hear one-tenth of the causes that demand his attention. The distance, the attendant expenses, the hopelessness of getting a hearing, are more than enough to deter thousands from seeking justice; but those who are hardy enough to prefer their complaints, find, when they arrive at the court, that the causes are conducted in this very curious manner. They are not conducted in English, which is the language understood by the judge; nor in Hindustanee, that of the people whose interests are at stake, but in Persian, which neither judge nor plaintiff knows a word of! Then, again, the policeman and the tax-gatherer are the same person! and whoever has to complain of what a multitude every day is suffering—of extortion, oppression, and insult, finds his enemy and oppressor the accuser and witness against him! But what is more, and which accounts for what Mr. Shore says of injured people paying bribes to avoid coming into these courts even as prosecutors or witnesses—the witnesses themselves are seized and imprisoned at the mercy of the court. In the Madras Herald of September 14, 1839, we find actual details of this practice, which the editor observes ‘is a practice so repugnant to the feelings of Englishmen, that were it told in any part of civilized Europe, would, no doubt, be scouted as a traveller’s tale.’ What is still more, and what we are sure that our countrymen in this happy land can have no idea of as existing now



anywhere under British rule—THE TORTURE IS APPLIED, to compel confession or payment of taxes! We know the serious nature of the charge we are now advancing, but we are prepared to prove it. We have, indeed, now before us petitions from most respectable native Christians, the Parawa Traders of Tutocoreen in Tinnivelly, in the Madras Presidency, which have been presented to Lord Elphinstone, but without any attention to them; in which they broadly state that they are compelled to pay a poll-tax first laid on their ancestors by the Mohammedan rulers, for their becoming Christians, and still most singularly continued by their Christian rulers—a tax for being Christians! and they as broadly state, that *on refusal to pay this tax*, THEY ARE TORTURED WITH THUMB SCREWS; AND WITH STANDING IN THE BURNING SUN WITH A HEAVY STONE ON THE SHOULDERS! Nay, we know individuals now in London, who have witnessed the infliction of the torture, and one gentleman in particular, who, for the simple fact of having represented to the government of the Presidency what he had seen, was ordered out of the country, leaving his property to the mercy of his enemies, and is now seeking redress here in vain. If any one would know still more of the combined imbecility and personal oppression of our Indian government, we will refer him to the work of F. C. Brown, Esq., of Tellicherry, on the Disturbances in Canara in 1837, the title of which will be found at the head of this article, and from which we proposed, had our space allowed, to have given some curious passages.

Here we must pause. We have, we are sure, produced sufficient evidence to show what a pandemonium of injustice, relentless avarice, and destructive impolicy is our great eastern territory. The subject before us is yet too vast and appalling to allow us to plunge further into it at present. The decay of the great public works, palaces, tanks, roads, &c.; the haughtiness and insolence of the English officials towards natives of all, even princely rank; their ignorance of the actual condition of the country, keeping themselves entirely aloof from the people; the peculiar condition of the half-castes, who call themselves now East Indians, and who must become the bond of our union with the country, or the levers of our ejection from it; the Resumption of the Tax-free lands in Bengal now causing so much heart-burning there, and for an account of which we refer our readers to Mr. Crawford's 'Appeal' on the subject; the immense injury to this country annually by the loss of revenue and of employment to our starving artizans by the present system; these, and many other great topics press for notice, but must stand over to another opportunity. On the subject of roads the Edinburgh Review talks of certain great lines of new roads made by government, but Rickards, Heber, Dr. Spry, Major-General Briggs, the able author of the History of the Land-Tax in India, and other most unquestionable authorities,

assure us that British India is, in fact, a country without roads, without bridges, without canals, without those great works which mark a well governed state. At a public meeting at Glasgow some months ago, Major-General Briggs, indeed, made this statement.

‘Then, of these military roads, there is hardly one of them over which I have not travelled ; and I say, without fear of contradiction, that there is scarcely ten miles of any part of them on which, during the rains, a carriage could be driven, or a loaded cart proceed without danger. Roads are marked out, it is true, they are levelled for the time being, and, till the wet season sets in, they are tolerably good ; but one or two years serves to break them up entirely ; roads without metal, without drains, without bridges,—and, to be rendered available even for the march of an army with its stores, a detachment of pioneers is required to precede the troops. There is another description of roads, however, to which much attention and money is devoted. I mean the roads within and around the Presidencies, and the principal civil and military stations. Each road not extending beyond three or four miles in length, and used purely for European gentlemen and ladies to drive their carriages.’\*

We also have now before us ‘A Minute of the Governor-General of India,’ of August last, containing this passage—‘As to the formation of roads, I fear, that, however valuable a really permanent and good road unquestionably is, for all purposes of national improvement, the hope of maintaining such roads, on an extensive scale, in the vast and poor territory and unfavorable climate of India, is not, for yet many years, to be entertained on a sober estimate of our difficulties and means.’ And this is said of India, after half a century of our good government, a country out of which we have drained *a thousand millions of money*, and are yet draining twenty millions a year ! This is that country whose finances the Edinburgh Review protests are so good that it will not need a loan for the payment of the vast expenses of the Afghan war ; and yet it cannot afford to make a road for the transit of its goods, or for the passage of grain in a season of famine !

Here, then, we close, for the present, our portraiture of what the clerk of the Board of Directors terms ‘the incomparably best governed of all our dependent possessions.’ If the scene which it presents does not rouse our countrymen to rescue it from the vampyre system under which it is sinking, we shall have no longer any faith in the philosophy, humanity, or commercial policy which have so long distinguished us as a nation. The interests of the people of India do not require a reform of Indian government more

---

\* The native gentry and even princes, who have made these roads at their own cost, are prohibited by soldiers stationed there on purpose, from driving on them at the hours that the English frequent them.

peremptorily than the interests of our starving manufacturers demand it. If India be such a beautiful scene of good government, why does not the East India Company invite all who doubt the fact to go out and see for themselves? If that be the case, that would settle the matter at once. All people who know that they have a flourishing scene to display, are glad that it should be seen. As it is, we call on our countrymen to inquire—inquire—inquire: and as the Edinburgh Review has not only appealed to the evidence of Mr. Shore, but to Lord William Bentinck, we will also appeal to his lordship's evidence, and with that close our remarks. In his evidence on the Steam question, delivered after he had been for years Governor-General of India, after comparing our rule with that of the Mohammedans who went before us, and showing that theirs was far superior to ours, he added—‘India in order to become an attached dependency of Great Britain, must be governed for her own sake, and not for the sake of the 800 or 1000 individuals who are sent from England to make their fortunes. *They are totally incompetent to the charge*, and in their hands, administration in all its civil branches, revenue, judicial, and police, has been a failure. Our government, to become secure, must be made popular, and to become so, it must consult the welfare of the many and not of the few. The government must remain arbitrary, but it may also be, and should be, paternal.’ But how can this be effected? ENGLAND HAS NO KNOWLEDGE OF AND NO CARE FOR INDIA. India, again, has no representatives in England; has hitherto, had no access to her shores; her fate is entirely in the hands of the two authorities with whom her management is vested. The Court of Directors seek their office for the sake of the patronage only; *for the most part, they are strangers to India*; have their own separate affairs\* to manage; are divested of responsibility; but from their permanency, and the knowledge which they derive from their numerous clients, they possess a power and influence over all affairs, which a temporary President of the Board of Control, unaided by any Board possessing local information, cannot possibly control.

---

\* The patronage of the Directors is divided into twenty-eight shares, each ordinary Director having one, the Chair and Deputy-Chair, having each two, and two being reserved for the President of the Board of Control. Each share is worth about £13,000, and a double share £20,000 a year. By this patronage they divide £2,000,000 sterling of the revenues of India amongst less than 1000 persons, from lads of fifteen or eighteen years of age and upwards, in salaries of about £2000 each, besides a claim of retiring superannuations. Well may Mr. Thornton, the clerk to the Directors, with their double share of £20,000 and £13,000, and the power of putting their connexions into good salaries of £2000 and upwards, declare that India is a beautifully governed country.



Art. VI. PUBLICATIONS OF THE CAMDEN SOCIETY.

*The Political Songs of England, from the Reign of John to that of Edward II.* Edited and Translated by THOMAS WRIGHT, Esq., M.A., F.S.A. London: John Bowyer Nichols.

THE Camden Society, a name of good omen, was formed about three years ago. It has since that time been in modest and silent but effective operation. Its objects are the publication of selections from those literary treasures which lie wrapt up in vast collections of manuscripts found in our public libraries; the reprinting of works of sufficient rarity and value to render such reprint desirable; and the translation of historical works not yet rendered into English.

As to inedited MSS., however precious they may be as 'curiosities of literature,' however deeply interesting to the antiquary, to the historian, to the philologist, in a word, to all who study the history of our language and manners, no private book-selling enterprize could be expected to publish them, since no sale could be calculated upon sufficiently large to indemnify it. The subscription which entitles to membership in this Society, and of course to a copy of its publications, is the moderate one of a guinea per annum, and the number of members is limited we believe to twelve hundred.

The society has already issued seven publications, and it is expected that its productions will in future appear with still greater frequency. They are put forth in an exceedingly elegant form, edited with great care and accuracy, and in all respects reflect much credit on the spirit and taste of those who have been employed to prepare them for the press.

Few of these publications would be very proper for review in a periodical like ours, or, indeed, in any other periodical except the 'Retrospective,' the discontinuance of which we have never ceased to deplore. But we are by no means inclined to underrate their importance or the interest. They are not only curious as remains of our own literature, but they reflect light on our general as well as our literary history, and on the manners and customs of former times; while, being printed *verbatim* from the ancient manuscripts, they afford to the student of our philology and grammar, a vast collection of valuable materials, and impart much knowledge respecting the state of the language in the earlier epochs of its history.

This series of publications, of which we can give little more than the titles, are 'An Alliterative Poem on the Deposition of King Richard II., by Richard de Maidstone, edited by

'Thomas Wright, Esq., of Trinity College, Cambridge.' This is from a very ancient MSS., since the author died at Aylesford in 1396. Secondly, 'A Historie of the Arrival of Edward IV. in England, and the Finall Recouerye of his Kingdomes from Henry VI. A.D. MCCCCLXXI. Edited by John Bruce, Esq., F.S.A.' Third, 'Kynge Johan. A Play, in two parts, by John Bale,' one of our old dramatists, who died 1563. This work is edited by J. Payne Collier, Esq., F.S.A., from the MS. of the author in the library of his Grace the Duke of Devonshire. Fourthly, a larger volume, entitled 'Plumpton Correspondence,' being a series of letters, chiefly domestic, written in the reigns of Edward IV., Richard III., Henry VII., and Henry VIII. Edited by Thomas Stapleton, Esq., F.S.A., from Sir Edward Plumpton's Book of Letters; with notices historical and biographical of the family of Plumpton, of Plumpton, in the county of York. These letters, with the exception of those of the Paston family, published some years ago in two volumes quarto, are the earliest specimens in the English language of familiar epistolary correspondence, and, as such, form a curious comment on the manners and customs of our ancestors, and, indeed, on their domestic life generally. Fifthly, 'Anecdotes and Traditions, illustrative of Early English History and Literature,' derived from MS. sources, and edited by William J. Thoms, Esq., F.S.A. Sixthly, 'A Chronicle of the First Thirteen Years of the Reign of King Edward the Fourth, by John Warkworth, D.D.,' and edited by James Orchard Halliwell, Esq., F.R.S., and lastly the volume which stands at the head of this article.

Each of these publications is preceded by a valuable historical introduction, affording ample materials for remark, if our space permitted. We shall restrict ourselves, however, in the present article, to the fifth of these volumes, which alone, from the nature of the matters it contains, and its comparative freedom from obsolete language and an antiquated orthography, we hope to make interesting to the generality of our readers. It is a curious *mélange*, partaking somewhat of the nature of Selden's 'Table-Talk,' Bacon's 'Apophthegms,' or Camden's 'Remains.' Of the motives in which the publication originated, the following account is given in the preface.

'In submitting to the Members of the Camden Society the following anecdotes and traditions, the editor feels called upon, before proceeding, to describe the sources from which they are derived, to explain the motives which induced him to suggest to the council the propriety of the present publication; a suggestion acceded to with kindness which calls forth his best thanks.

'In the first place, then, it appeared to the editor very desirable

that the Society should follow the example set them by Chaucer, whose intermixture of lighter matters, amidst the graver portions of his 'Canterbury tales,' has been the subject of frequent and well deserved encomium; so that those members of the society who think Minerva looks most bewitching when her face is dimpled with a smile, may be allowed an occasional glimpse of their divinity in that mood which they deem the happiest.

'In the next place, the delight with which the few works of a similar character, existing in English literature, such as Selden's Table Talk, Bacon's Apophthegms, Spence's Anecdotes, and though last not least in our dear love, Camden's Remains, have been perused by innumerable readers, convinced him that a volume of 'Camdeniana,' even though it should be of far inferior merit to its admirable prototypes, would not be without its admirers. He was of course aware that the scattered anecdotes to be found in its pages would by many, be looked upon as trifling contributions to our stores of knowledge, scarcely as bricks from which great buildings might be made, scarcely perhaps as the straws necessary to make the bricks. Yet on the other hand he felt persuaded, that these materials trifling as they seemed, were worthy of preservation, and capable of being turned to good account.'

The work is divided into three parts, the first of which is entirely derived from the Harleian MS. No. 6395, entitled 'Merry Passages and Jests,' compiled by Sir Nicholas Lestrangle, elder brother of that singular genius, Sir Roger Lestrangle. This MS. our author tells us contains a collection of nearly six hundred articles, of which the reader is here presented with a hundred and forty-one; the greater part of the rest being either not worth publication or not fit to be published. To this portion of the work there are prefixed some extensive notices of Sir Nicholas Lestrangle and his family, by John Gough Nichols, Esq.

The second part of the book is derived from the Lansdowne MS. No. 231, written by John Aubrey, and containing some of the materials collected for a projected work, which was to have been entitled 'Remains of Gentilism and Judaism.'

The third part has been extracted from No. 3890 of the 'Additional MSS.' in the British Museum, from the common-place book of a Mr. John Collett.

The second part is undoubtedly not without interest, as recording many of the singular superstitions of our own country; but the first part is the one likely to prove most attractive. It is in fact a sort of elder Joe Miller, with frequently an additional advantage derived from the quaintness and raciness of the olden time. From this we shall proceed to present the reader with a few extracts.

*'A LONG SERMON.'*

'There was one preacht in summer and stood two houres; and one



say'd at dinner that 'twas a very good sermon, but halfe on't would have done well cold.'

\* \* This sermon must have been preached by the rector of Bibury, of whom Fosbroke, in his *British Monachism*, speaking on the subject of hour glasses as furniture for pulpits, tells us, he used always to preach two hours, regularly turning the glass. After the text, the squire of the parish withdrew, smoked his pipe, and returned to the blessing.

‘WITHIN AN ACE ON’T,

‘A falconer of Sir Robert Mordant’s not knowing his dogges name, called one of them Cinque whose name was Sice, and my cozen Harry Mordant telling him his error, ‘Faith, Sir,’ says he, ‘’twas well I came so neare: I am sure I was within an ace on’t.’’

‘DOD THE DECALOGIST.

‘One Dod, who was nephew to the minister who wrote upon the commandments, went up and down Paule’s Church-yard amongst the stationers, enquiring for his unkle upon the commandments.’

\* \* The uncle of this simple gentleman, who was unquestionably the party recorded in Joe Miller as having inquired at the post office for a letter ‘from his father in the country,’ was the celebrated Hebrew scholar John Dod, of Jesus College, Cambridge. He was an eminent Puritan divine; and from his *Exposition of the Ten Commandments* here alluded to, and which he wrote in conjunction with Robert Cleaver, he was commonly called the Decalogist.

‘ONE GOOD TURN DESERVES ANOTHER.

‘Sir Martin Stuteville’s father riding abroad one day, with him attending on him, he rode by the nurse’s house that over-laide his eldest sonne, at which time the nurse stode at the dorre: ‘Looke you there, Martin,’ sayde his father, ‘there stands she that made you an elder brother.’ ‘Is that she, Sir,’ says he, ‘marry God’s blessing on her heart for it!’ and presently galloppe up to her and gives her a couple of shillings.’

‘A GOOD EXPOSITION.

‘The Archbishop of Canterbury had an house by Croydon, pleasantly sited, but that it was too much wood-bound, so he cutt downe all upon the front to the high-way. Not long after the Lord Chancellor Bacon riding by that way, ask’t his man whose faire house that was. He told him ‘my Lord of Canterburie’s.’ ‘It is not possible,’ says he, ‘for his building is environed with woode.’ ‘’Tis true, Sir,’ says he, ‘it was so, but he hath lately cut most of it downe.’ ‘By my troth,’ answered Bacon, ‘he has done very judiciously, for before me-thought it was a very obscure and darke place, but now he has expounded and cleared it up wonderfully well.’

‘A BORN JUSTICE.

‘There was one Mr. Guybon, a gentleman of very weak understand-

ing, but yet in commission, who having often publish't his folly upon the bench, at last sayes a sly plaine fellow to another, 'I pray, Sir, was not Mr. Guybon borne a Justice of Peace?' as, if his office had not descended upon him with his estate, by right of inheritance, sure no one would ever have made him one.'

'A SPECIAL ENTAIL.

'The Lord Chief Justice Richardson went with Mr. Mewtis, the Clarke of the Councell, to see his fine house at Gunness-bury, which was furnish't with many pretty knacks and rarities. My lord view'd all, and lik't it well, but, 'Mr. Mewtis,' says he, 'if you and I agree upon the price, I must have all your fooleries and bables into the bargain.' 'Why, my lord,' says he, 'for those I will not stand with you. They may e'ne be entail'd, if you please, upon you and your heires.'

'HONESTY REWARDED.

'A gentleman overtakes in the evening a plaine country fellow, and ask't him how far it was to such a towne. 'Tenne miles, Sir,' says he. 'It is not possible,' sayes the gentleman. 'It is no lesse,' says the fellow. 'I tell you it was never counted above five.' 'Tis tenne indeed, Sir,' says the fellow,—and thus they were arguing *pro and con* a long time. At last says the countryman to him, 'I'll tell you what I'll do, Sir, because you seeme to be an honest gentleman, and your horse is almost tyr'd, I will not stand with you, you shall have it for five, but as I live whosoever comes next shall ride tenne.'

'HE COULD ON EITHER SIDE DISPUTE.

'Dr. Love told Dr. Collins, 'Nay, wee know well enough what you are (insinuating his Arminianism): for you disputed both wayes.' 'Nay,' sayes Collins, 'for that very reason you don't know what I am.'

'THE LAW AND THE GOSPEL.

'One Dr. Warren, a divine in degree and profession, yet seldome in the pulpitt or church, but a justice of peace and very pragmaticall in secular business; having a fellow before him good refractorie, and stubborne, 'Well, sirrha,' says he, 'goe your wayes. I'll teach you law, I'll warrant you.' 'Sir,' sayes he, 'I had rather your worshippe would teach us some gospell.'

'DRINKING DEEP.

'One ask't Sir John Millesent how he did so conforme himselfe to the grave justices his brothers, when they mett. 'Why, in faith,' sayes he, 'I have no way but to drinke myselfe downe to the capacitie of the bench.'

'VERY HUNGRY INDEED.

'Says one that was very empty and hungry, 'If I gett not some victuals, my stomach gnawes so, as I thinke it will eate me up.'

## ' CATHEDRAL MUSIC.

' One coming into a cathedrall whose quire consisted of very ill voices, and made a lamentable noise, said, ' Sure the prophecy of Amos was there fulfilled, cap. viii., v. 3 : And the songs of the temple shall be howlings.'

## ' DOUBLE DAMAGES.

' A fellow was censured to the pillorie, and his head being in, he raised himself on his tippe-toes, and the foot-ledge brake, being old, rotten, and disus'd, and there the poore wretch hung by the necke in danger of his life ; after his penance, he brings his action against the towne for the insufficiency of the pillorie, and recovers against them.

## ' A GREAT DIFFERENCE.

' In Lynne their Maior is always chosen out of the twelve aldermen, and they out of eighteen others. One of the eighteen being at Rising (an ancient but decayed burrow-towne), and the then Maior a mechanicke man, a butcher or the like, sayes he : ' Mr. Maior, I hear you have a very odd forme and manner of election here of your Maior.' ' Why how is that ?' sayes the Maior. ' Why, they say for certain that you and all your brethren goe into a barne, where every man hath his bottle of hay layde him for a cushion : then ther's a calf turned in at the barne dore, and look to what bottle the calfe goe first, hee's the man.' ' Why, then,' sayes he, ' I see the difference betwixt us and our brethren at Lynne ; wee choose with one calf, and you with eightene.'

## ' A REASONABLE MOTION.

' A motion being made in the House of Commons that such as were chosen to serve in the parliament troopes should be faithfull and skillfull riders, Mr. Waller's opinion was demanded, who approved the forme of it as excellent, ' for,' sayes he, ' it is most necessary the riders be faithfull least they runne away with their horses, and skilfull least their horses runne away with them !'

## ' THE RETORT UNCOURTEOUS.

' A gentleman that had mighty large and retorted Austrian lipps, comming from the barber's, ask't his familiar friend how he lik't his trimming, ' Y'faith very well,' sayes he, ' but that he has turned up thy lipps instead of thy beard.'

## ' A POOR NOBLEMAN.

' Sir Jostlin Percy, being told that the Councell had fined him 1000 markes, laught exceedingly at it. One ask't him the reason. He answered that ' The Privy Councell were so wise as they knew where to find 1000 markes ; for hang me if I know where to find 1000 pence,' sayes he.

## ' ARCHEE, THE JESTER.

' King James was complaining one time of the leannesse of his



Hunting Horse, and swore by his sole he could see no reason but his should be as fat as any of his subjects; for he bestow'd upon him as good feeding, keeping, and as easy riding as any one did, and yet the jade was leane. Archee his foole, standing by, told him, 'If that be all, take no care: I'll teach your Majestie a way to raise his flesh presently; and if he be not as fat as ever he wallow, you shall ride me.' 'I pry'thee, foole, how?' sayde the king. 'Why, doe but make him a Bishoppe, and I'll warrant you,' sayes Archee.

*'A DRAUGHT HORSE.*

'A scholler riding his horse hott into the water to drinke, scarce up to the fetlock, one wisht him to goe in deeper (least he foundered his horse); 'Hang him, jade;' sayes he, 'let him drink up this first.'

*'A GLASS TOO LITTLE.*

'Capt. Robert Bacon, revelling at Sir W. Paston's, had his sack served him in a curious Venice glass, but very much under the size that he us'd to trade in. And after a long contemplation of his measure 'Sir William,' sayes he, 'if you value this glasse (as I beleewe you doe), tye a good long string to it, to draw him up againe, for I shall swallow him down at one time or another.'

As we have already spoken at some length of Robert Bacon, in the note to No. XII., our fittest illustration to the present story will, perhaps, be found in a somewhat similar anecdote.

'The manager of a Scotch theatre, at which Kean was playing Macbeth, seeing him greatly exhausted towards the close of the performance, offered him some whiskey in a small thistle-glass, saying at the same time, by way of encouragement, 'Take that Mr. Kean; take that, sir. It is the real mountain dew; that will never hurt you, sir!' 'No,' said Kean, with a significant glance at the *homœopathic* dose, 'No; that I'll be sworn it would'nt—if it was vitriol!'

*'A PROFITABLE EXPERIMENT.*

'A sturdie vagrant, on the high way, begged good-sawcily on Sir Drue Drurie. 'Ay, sirrha,' sayes he, 'such as you make all your kinne fare the worse; for this is your fashion, deny ye but once (though happily not in earnest), a man's back is no sooner turn'd but ye curse him to the pitt of hell.' 'Ah, sir,' sayes he, 'your worship is mistaken in me, I am none of those.' 'I 'faith,' sayes Sir Drue, 'I'll try thee for this once,' and away he rides.

*'WHERE THE WISE MEN CAME FROM.*

'Sands, a gentleman of a bold spirit and witt, being called to shrift by Lenthall (then Speaker to the House of Commons), and some ridiculous and impertinent interrogations put to him, was ask't at last what countriman he was. 'Of Kent,' sayes he, 'for I will neither blush at my name or native soyle; and now, sir, I pray let me demand the same from you?' 'I am out of the West,' sayes Lenthall. 'By

my troth,' sayes Sands, 'so I thought, for I am sure all the *wise men* came out of the East.'

'AN ILL PROPHECY.

'Old Fram. Gawdey, walking with a young gallant in London streets, that us'd to be most vainly prodigall in his habit and dresse, and finding that the splendour of his comrade drew such a goodly traine of beggars, whose broken consort quite confounded the harmonie of their private and their serious discourse; and perceiving that they would not desist or disperse, after many thundering oaths and execrations from the gallant, Fram turns about very soberly, and sayes, 'Good people, be quiet, and let the gentleman alone, for hee's a very sociable and sweet natured man; and I'll be bound he shall keepe you company within one twelvemonth.'

'A GOOD SERMON BAD IN ITS EFFECTS.

'A minister having preached a very long sermon, as his custom was, some hours after ask't a gentleman his approbation of it; he replied that, 'Twas very good, but that it had spoyled a goose worth two of it.'

We think the Camden Society likely to prove eminently useful to literature; especially if they proceed in their selection of the MSS. to be published, with due deliberation. We beg leave to suggest to them the propriety of publishing some of the hitherto unedited Anglo-Saxon MSS., than which they could not confer a greater benefit on Anglo-Saxon scholars. Interspersed with their graver works, they might now and then publish a volume from the immense mass of familiar letters of distinguished men, hitherto concealed in the archives of the British Museum. Familiar letters are always amongst the most amusing portions of literature, and besides being amusing, seldom fail to contain interesting matter, both biographical and historical. We heartily wish the Society all success.

---

Art. VII. *Travels in South Eastern Asia, with notices of Missionary Stations, and a full account of the Burman Empire.* By the Rev. HOWARD MALCOM, of Boston. 2 vols. London: Tilt, Fleet Street, 1839.

PERHAPS no country under the wide expanse of heaven, possesses so many powerful claims on the attention of the student of the world's great family as Hindustan. The extent of her territory, the luxurious prodigality of her soil, the magnificence of her ocean streams, the unparalleled altitude of her

mountain precipices, the riches and splendor of her mineral and fossil kingdoms, and her almost incalculable resources in carrying on commercial intercourse with other nations, render her a fit subject for philosophical contemplation. If we trace the long line of her population through the dim vista of ancient history, we shall behold it maintain one continuous march from the very birth-place of nations to this moment, connecting in one unbroken succession the wanderers of the plains of Shinar with the men of modern days. In looking at her moral state, we see a yet more wonderful—an awful spectacle—a scene of horrific grandeur! In the swollen and loathsome decrepitude of her gigantic superstitions, we discern the identical features of that spiritual domination which, in its more vigorous age, gave birth to the mythology of Egypt and of Greece, combining at the same instant in one shapeless mass of impurity, the gross licentiousness of an early, with the impotence of a declining age. Her chamber of imagery exhibits a huge frame-work composed of the broken and disjointed particles of original tradition, in which is grouped together all that is mystic in the Cabiric, Eleusinian, or Dionysiac systems; one lurid light, and one alone, illumining the chaotic darkness, the light which glares from surrounding putrescence. Her religious theory, possessing exactly that degree of energy which awakens the susceptibilities of her devotees, in order to plunge them into all the horrors of a cruel and debasing superstition: gratifying, and at the same time degrading the mighty and universal love of man for the supernatural, by the exhibition of deities distinguished from man alone by the greater impurity and more unrestrained gratification of their passions; completes the whole process of mental degradation by substituting a rigorous code of reiterated ablutions, bodily contortions, and self-inflicted torments, for the great realities of man's moral existence. Nothing can exceed the interest, the mournful interest of such a spectacle! India is the great temple of the world's idolatry, and prone before her obscene and colossal gods, lie her debased millions, soulless, and lifeless, as though the retributive justice of an offended deity had changed them into stone, in the very moment of their earliest superstition, and left them an existing but a breathless monument of the folly of idolatry,—a pillar of salt to survivors.

Nevertheless, to a student of the great family of mankind, Hindustan presents an unequalled range of observation. In no portion of the globe are there presented to the view so many different types of our species. The effeminate Bengalee, the courtly Cingalese, the crafty Siamese, the fierce Malay, the majestic Afghan, the athletic Bundella, the hardy Goorkha and Nepanlese, the sturdy Burman, and the semi-barbarous aborigines of the mountains of Rajamahl, all inhabit the two peninsulas



which pass under the common name of India, besides innumerable smaller tribes who shade down, with every possible variation, the greater distinctions to which we have particularly referred. Here dwell the worshippers of Mahomet, the worshippers of fire, the devotee of the great Lama, the Hindu, the Buddhist, the Sain, and the several seceders from each system, whom either caprice, or the anxious search, after a more rational and more consistent creed, has induced to leave the ranks of orthodoxy. To the philologist this land is a mine of learning. Already have the industrious sons of Germany wrought here with great success; and deduced, on principles which cannot be doubted, that the languages of Greece and Rome borrowed much of their structure from that *officina linguarum*, the Sanscrit, and there is but little doubt that future Scaligers will trace, through the meanderings of its many dependent streams, the origin of other dialects which at present appear to spring up without a parent.

To Britons, above all, the plains of India have associations of the most solemn and affecting nature. There are but few families in this land who do not look to it as the sepulchre of some of their dearest relatives. To its spirit-kindling shores the loftiest and most vigorous of our youth have departed in pursuit of wealth or honor, and in that pursuit have perished. The laurels of British India grow on the tombs of those we loved. Even now as our pen traces this memorial of the land where we passed some of our earliest and most buoyant years, we behold with an interest which the lapse of twenty years has scarcely softened, the lonely spot almost hidden amongst the bold mountains of Bundelkund, where lies the brave and rugged soldier of many battles, whose fostering care directed and controlled the energies of our early enthusiasm. He fell on that neighbouring hill, a bloody sacrifice to war! And if we dared trust ourselves to the mournful remembrance, we could tell of others, and they too dear to some we love, who in the first bloom of manhood left the widowed mother and the sorrowing sister, and sought on the same blood-stained field the same phantom of honor, and found an early tomb. We forbear the melancholy subject. We have bade a long, a last farewell to the land watered by the hundred arms of Ganga, and protected by the snow-capped peaks of gigantic Himalaya. But still she is dear to our hearts; there we left the brave, and those we loved.

And in a still higher sense is India interesting to our better feelings. Consigned to the care and to the moral influence of our country for many years by the over-ruling providence of God, how much do we owe her! How much for the sad omission of a right use of our mental superiority! How much more for the awful exhibition of a moral example differing only from the vice of home production by the superior energy of

our physical and mental constitution. India has long known the prowess of our troops in the struggle of war, and has acknowledged the extent of our scientific applications; she has yet to learn that any thing of a moral or religious power can be associated with our name. On every plain, on every mount of her great peninsula, wave the trophies of Britain's valor, but alas, the monuments of her benevolence are yet to be erected. Yet we believe a new era of India's history is about to be begun. The names of Martyn, Buchanan, and Carey, and those of our trans-Atlantic countrymen, Boardman and Judson, will be mentioned by future ages as those of the real benefactors of that country, and Britain will be remembered by the annalists of Hindustan, not only as the birth-place of her conquerors, but as the guardian angel, whose divine instructions first dispelled the thick darkness under whose influence her children had been so long enslaved and debased, and imparted the salutary direction of true religion to lead them back again to God.

The present volumes are the record of a missionary voyage undertaken by some of our brethren of the United States of America, for the purpose of visiting the stations under their direction in the south-eastern parts of Asia. As the result of this design, the author, Mr. Howard Malcom, a minister of Boston, in New England, records his voyage to Burma, and thence to Calcutta, with his visits to the different stations in the vicinity of those places, as well those under the auspices of other religious bodies, as those immediately connected with the society to which he belongs. It is a pleasing feature of the production, that no trace of a sectarian spirit is discernible in these accounts; in truth, so little of any thing denominational is apparent, that we are left to infer from some incidental allusions, that the writer is of the Baptist persuasion.

The missionary press has, within a few years past, presented to the reading public many volumes of a very interesting character, containing the observations of Ellis, Stewart, Williams, Medhurst, Gutzlaff, and others, on several portions of the world hitherto little known; but we venture to say, that never has it produced a work of more interest or utility than the present. We are not sure that any two volumes of an equal size in the whole circle of British literature, contain so much useful and correct information on the several countries of India, in the various relations of their natural productions, and their population, considered as to their political and religious diversities.

On the occasion of coming in contact with an English vessel voyaging to Australia, Mr. Malcom observes;—‘They belonged to our father-land; they came from the noblest nation earth ever saw; they were but lately engaged against us in horrid war; they bore to a distant home a motley crew of refined and vulgar,

'educated and ignorant, now reduced by sin to common convicts and exiles. . . . O that this native land may long remain the pillar of freedom, the source of noble missionary endeavour; that her stupendous navy may rot in peace; that the ship may have souls born to God among her crowd; and that the convict colony may soon be a part of Christ's precious church.' —pp. 8, 9. This is kind in a Bostonian, and intimates that the most English portion of the States has not forgotten the land whence the 'Plymouth pilgrims' sailed, the soil where the tree of liberty first grew and flourished alone, till a scion was transplanted to the shores beyond the Atlantic.

The first volume is mainly devoted to an account of the Burman Empire. The statistical information given by Mr. Malcom respecting the natural productions and the social and political institutions of this country, is, as far as our information extends, beyond what is conveyed in any single volume in our language. The account of Buddhism, the professed religion of the Burmese, is also judicious, and accurate, so far as the author has thought it necessary to explain that extraordinary specimen of heathen mythology: as, however, this system is abundantly explained by many modern writers, we shall forbear making any extracts from this excellent summary. In truth, valuable as is the information thus collected on the spot by our missionary brethren, and highly as on this account their labors will be appreciated by the student of natural history, and the philosophic observer of the political and religious state of different portions of the earth's great family, we confess that our author's account of the work and success of his fellow-laborers, in the great design of evangelizing this portion of the world is to us most interesting. Thus of the different sections of this valuable work, we should select that portion which gives an account of the triumph of the gospel amongst the degraded and almost barbarous tribe of Karens, as decidedly the most pleasing. It should be observed, that these people, formerly in the rudest state of nature, and living in a degree of cultivation removed but the slightest possible shade from the habits of savage life, had been for some years before Mr. Malcom's visit, under the superintendence of the brethren of one of the American missionary Societies; and by the means of the civilization which invariably results from the reception of the gospel, had been constrained to change their wandering locomotive habits, into those more congenial with the decencies of humanity. Amongst other objects of our author's missionary visit, he was instructed to enter into a minute inquiry into the state of these new converts; and the following is an account of his first interview with them.

'Two days' journey from Tevoy, a considerable number of Karens, converted in different places, have been brought together, and formed



into a Christian village ; the heads of every family being members of the church. These Christians now amount to about two hundred, and conduct themselves with exemplary rectitude. By the aid of the missionaries they have obtained goats, bullocks, oil-mills, seeds, &c. ; and with these, and still more by the increased industry they have been taught to practice, they have been enabled to cease their wanderings, and acquire many comforts to which their countrymen are strangers. Cleanliness, in which Karens are universally deficient, has been attained in no small degree. The men have been exhorted to raise plenty of cotton, and the women induced so to apply themselves to spinning and weaving, as to furnish every one of their families with a change of raiment. They now wash their garments often, which before they never did. . . . But it is the spiritual change visible at Mata (literally, love, the Christian name of the village), which is most delightful. In this respect, they present a most attractive spectacle. Punctual in all public services, they fill a large zayat on the sabbath, and manifest a decorum and devotion far superior to any thing ordinarily seen in America. Being a musical people, and having a book of over a hundred hymns composed by Mr. Mason, they almost without succession unite in the singing, and to my ear their psalmody was correct and sweet. After a prayer or a benediction, they all utter an audible ' *Amen*,' remain silent on their knees for the space of half a minute, and retire in perfect silence—a practice which would greatly improve our meetings. Mr. Wade has been in the habit of holding daily a prayer-meeting with them at sun-rise. Almost every morning, before day-light, many gather at the zayat, and commence singing hymns. As soon as Mrs. Wade is seen issuing from her door at sun-rise, they strike the gong, and presently the multitude come together. It is remarkable, that not one man or woman refuses to pray when called upon. On Sunday, a Sunday-school is held in the morning, at which all the children of proper age attend ; those that are not professors being formed into one company, and the others into another, superintended by the missionary and his wife alternately. Public worship and preaching are held morning and evening. The afternoon is frequently employed in baptizing, or administering the communion ; and when this is not the case, prayer-meetings are held at the houses of the sick. Some fifty or more members of the church live at different distances in the country, as far round as five or six miles. These attend punctually, generally walking in on Saturday afternoon, that they may lose no part of the blessed day.

It will of course be supposed that this people, so lately wild and wandering, without books, without even the forms of religion, and furnished as yet with no part of the word of God in their own tongue, and but a single manuscript copy of the gospel of Matthew, would be exceedingly ignorant of the claims of christianity. They are indeed so. But it is exhilarating to see the readiness and cordiality with which they enter into the performance of every duty, as soon as it is made known to them. Time would fail to describe all the instances which illustrate this remark, but one or two may be named. Mrs. W. had on one occasion read to them that chapter in Matthew, which,

describing the judgment, speaks of visiting Christ (as represented in his disciple) when sick, or in prison, &c. They at once said how regardless they had been of persons under sickness and sorrow; and the very next day began to perform services to the sick, such as they had never thought of doing before. A poor widow, who had a leprous sort of disease, and a child about two years old, similarly affected, were visited by many of them the very next day. They performed many repulsive offices for her and her child; brought water, cleaned the house, gave them rice and other articles, and so enriched and comforted the poor creature, that she was bewildered with delight. These attentions have continued constantly. Another, who was bed-ridden with loathsome sores, was attended to in the same way. Since that time, no one is suffered to want any thing which the rest enjoy. These kindnesses are done with studied concealment, and can be learned only from the beneficiaries themselves.

‘On being told of the persecution of Moug San-lone and others at Rangoon, and how they had been chained, imprisoned, and excessively fined, they unexpectedly proposed subscribing toward paying his fine, and releasing them from prison; and out of their deep poverty actually sent to Rangoon fifty rupees for this purpose. They have built of their own accord a sufficient house for the residence of their missionary and his family, and a zayat. A greater evidence of Christian generosity is seen in their missionary zeal. Those whose abilities, as assistants or schoolmasters, warrant the missionaries in sanctioning it, are ever ready to part with their families, and go wearisome journeys of six months at a time, among distant villages, where they are utterly unknown, carrying on their backs tracts and food, sleeping on the way in trees, or on the ground, and enduring many privations. Young men, whose services are very important to their aged parents, in cleaning jungle, and planting paddy, are readily spared, and go to various points, during the rainy season, teaching school, for which their salary is from 8s. to 12s. sterling a month—half what they could earn in other employ. About twenty schoolmasters and assistants are now thus employed. Mr. Mason has in his excursions baptized many converts who were brought to the knowledge of the truth by these assistants. His last journey among the retired villages between Tavoy and Mergui, has been cheered by the reception of a number of such.

‘The change in regard to temperance is not less remarkable. Unlike the Burmans, whose religion utterly forbids strong drink, and who scarcely ever use it, the Karens use it universally, and generally to excess: every family makes arrack for themselves, and from the oldest to the youngest partake. Drunkenness, with all its train of horrors is rife among them of course. But no sooner do any become serious inquirers, and consort with the disciples for further instruction, than they totally abandon the accursed thing. In Mata, therefore, not a drop is made or drunk. The children of the very men who were sots, are growing up without having tasted or seen it. The consequences to domestic peace and general welfare may be supposed.

‘It will be recollected, that they knew nothing of letters, or books, till Mr. Wade reduced their language to writing about three years ago.

It is found that the system he has adopted is eminently philosophical, and so easy for learners, that, in a few weeks pupils who have never seen a letter learn to read with facility.'—pp. 37—40.

The following account of the caves in Burmah, which are used as temples for the worship of their many-shaped deities, is an affecting monument of the folly of idolatry.

'Most of these mountains contain caves, some of them very large, which appear to have been, from time immemorial, specially devoted to religious purposes. The wealth and labour bestowed on these are of themselves sufficient to prove how great the population has been in former ages. I visited in these excursions, three of the most remarkable,—one on the Dah Gyieng, and two on the Salwen. They differed only in extent, and in the apparent antiquity of the idols they contained. Huge stalactites descended almost to the floor in many places, while in others, stalagmites of various magnitudes and fantastic shapes, were formed upon the floor. In each, the bats occupied the lofty recesses of the ceiling, dwelling in deep and everlasting twilight. In one they seemed innumerable. Their ordure covered the bottom, in some places, to the depth of many feet. Throwing up some fragments of idols, we disturbed their noon-tide slumbers, and the effect was prodigious. The flutter of their wings created a trembling or pulsation in the air like that produced by the deepest bass of a great organ. In the dusk of the evening, they issue from the cave in a thick column, which extends unbroken for miles. The natives all affirmed this to be the case every evening: and Mr. Judson himself, when here with Major Crawford and others, saw the almost incredible fact. This cave has evidently been long deserted, except that a single large image at the entrance is kept in repair, before which were some recent offerings. I might therefore have easily obtained images for my friends, but Mr. J., being afraid of an injurious influence on the native Christians who were with us, I abstained, and afterwards obtained a supply by regular purchase.

'The last one we visited is on the Salwen, about fifteen or twenty miles above Maulmain. The entrance is at the bottom of a perpendicular but uneven face of the mountain, enclosed in a strong brick wall which forms a large vestibule. The entrance to this enclosure is by a path, winding along the foot of the mountain; and nothing remarkable strikes the eye till one passes the gate, where the attention is at once powerfully arrested. Not only is the space within the wall filled with images of Gaudama, of every size, but the whole face of the mountain, to the height of eighty or ninety feet, is covered with them. On every jutting crag stands some marble image, covered with gold, and spreading its uncouth proportions to the setting sun. Every recess is converted into shrines for others. The smooth surfaces are covered by small flat images of burnt clay and set in stucco. Of these last there are literally thousands. In some places they have fallen off, with the plaster in which they are set, and left spots of naked rock, against which bees have built their hives undisturbed. Nowhere in the



country have I seen such a display of wealth, ingenuity, and industry. But imposing as is this spectacle, it shrinks to insignificance, compared to the scene which opens on entering the cavern itself. It is of vast size, chiefly in one apartment, which needs no human art to render it sublime. The eye is confused, and the heart appalled, at the prodigious exhibition of infatuation and folly. Everywhere, on the floor, overhead, on the jutting points, and on the stalactite festoons of the roof, are crowded together images of Gaudama—the offerings of successive ages. Some are perfectly gilded; others incrustated with calcareous matter: some fallen, yet sound; others mouldered; others just erected. Some of these are of stupendous sizes; some not larger than one's finger; and some of all the intermediate sizes; marble, stone, wood, brick, and clay. Some even of marble, are so time worn, though sheltered, of course, from changes of temperature, that the face and fingers are obliterated. In some dark recesses, bats were heard, and seemed numerous, but could not be seen. Here and there are models of temples, kyoungs, &c., some not larger than half a bushel, and some ten or fifteen feet square, absolutely filled with small idols, heaped promiscuously one upon another. As we followed the path which wound among the groups of figures and models, every new aspect of the cave presented new multitudes of images. A ship of five hundred tons could not carry away the half of them.

'Alas! where now are the successive generations whose hands wrought these wonders, and whose hearts confided in these deceits? Where are the millions who came hither to confess their sins to gods that cannot hear, and spread their vain oblations to him that cannot save? The multitudes are gone, but the superstition remains. The people are left like the gleanings of the vintage, but the sway of a senseless, hopeless system, is undiminished. Fewer bow in these dark recesses, but no better altars witness holier devotions. May we not hope better things from the effect of a full toleration secured by the present rulers, and a full tide of missionary effort set forward by American churches. Thanks be to God, that a Christian nation rules these provinces, and a Christian community sends forth light and truth! Happy and auspicious is the mental dawn which now begins to break! May Christians pray it into perfect day!'—pp. 61—63.

The second volume of this work is occupied with an account of the author's visit to Bengal. In this portion of his labors, Mr. Malcom has had many precursors, and though he cannot be said to have added much to the information already possessed, yet his statements are so judiciously selected, and so pleasingly presented, that we are constrained to give him much praise for the manner in which he has exhibited the principal features of British India. The following account of the arrival at Calcutta is exceedingly graphic; we vouch for its faithfulness.

'As the ship ascends the river (generally a slow and difficult process), objects of interest multiply. Fishermen's villages and scattered

huts appear on each side, embosomed in stately palms. Trees of shapes unknown before, fields of sugar-cane, wide levels of paddy ground, and a universal greenness keep up an interest, till, on reaching Gloucester, European houses begin to be seen, and the ear once more catches the sounds of machinery and commerce. The cold emotions of wonder, and the pain of reflecting that one has arrived in the regions of degradation and idolatry, now give place to a sense of exhilaration and homeness. On every side is the evidence of the presence of those who stand with the highest amongst the civilized, the free, the scientific, and the religious nations of the earth. Hope portrays the future, benevolence stands ready to act, and discouragement is cheered by assurance of co-operation.

'At length, in passing a bend in the river called 'Garden Reach,' a superb array of country seats opens on the eastern coast. Luxury and refinement seem here to have their home. Verdant and quiet lawns appear doubly attractive to a voyager, weary of ocean and sky. Buildings coated with plaster, and combining Grecian chasteness with oriental adaptation, lift their white columns amid noble trees and numerous banks. Steam-boats, budgerows, and dingies ply about upon the smooth water. The lofty chimneys of gas-works and factories rise in the distance, and every thing bespeaks your approach to a great city.

'We passed just at sunset. The multiform vehicles, for which Calcutta is famous, stood before the doors, or rolled away through the trees, followed by turbaned servants in flowing muslin. Ladies and children, with nurses and bearers, lounged along the smooth paths; and it was difficult to realize that this beautiful climate should prove so insidious. The general observation, however, is, that death owes more victims to high living, indolence, exposure at night, fatigue in shooting excursions, &c., than to the positive effects of climate. Indeed, some affirm India to be as salubrious as England; and the aspect of some who have been long in the country would seem to countenance the assertion.

'A farther advance brings an indistinct view of the fort and the fine buildings of the Chowmghy suburb, all presented in one great curve, which is soon relinquished for a more minute and inquisitive contemplation of 'the Course.' This is a broad road on the bank of the river, passing round the esplanade and fort, to which the English residents drive every evening at sunset. As every clerk in the city keeps his buggy or palankeen carriage, the crowd of vehicles rivals that at Hyde Park. The sight is even more imposing. Most of the higher classes use stately tandems or open barouches; and the ladies are without bonnets. Crowds of gentlemen are on horseback. Indian side-runners give a princely air to the slow procession. The shipping of every nation, the clear horizon, the noble fort, the city front, the pleasure boats, the beautiful ghauts, &c., make it a scene which always pleases; and the citizens repair thither from day to day, and from year to year, without weariness or satiety.

'On passing Garden Reach, the river becomes covered with boats, of every conceivable form, from which a dozen different languages meet the ear. A multitude of vessels lie at anchor; steam-engines pour

from their towering chimneys volumes of smoke ; beautiful ghauts slope into the water ; palankeens, tonjons, buggies, coaches, phaetons, gares, caranches, and hackaries, line the shore, and before us spreads out the great city, containing, with its suburbs, almost a million of souls.

‘ All who die in or beside the river, and even those whose dead bodies are committed to it, being deemed certain of future bliss, multitudes are brought to die upon the banks, or are laid at low water on the mud, whence the return of the tide washes them away. These and the half consumed relics from the funeral pile, in every variety of revolting aspect, are continually floating by. Government boats ply above the city to sink these bodies ; but many escape, and we daily saw them float by, while vultures stood upon them, contending for the horrid banquet.

‘ There being no wharfs, no docks, you are rowed to a ghaut in a dingey, and landed amid Hindus performing their ablutions and reciting their prayers. No sooner does your boat touch the shore, than a host of bearers contend for you with loud jabber, and those whom you resist least, actually bear you off in their arms through the mud, and you find yourself at once in one of those strange conveyances, a palankeen. Away you hie, flat on your back, at the rate of nearly five miles an hour, a chatty boy bearing aloft a huge palm leaf umbrella, to keep off the sun, whom no assurances that you do not want him will drive away, but who expects only a para or two for his pains. The bearers grunt at every step, like our southern negroes when cleaving wood ; and though they do it as a sort of chorus, it keeps your unaccustomed feelings discomposed.

‘ Arrived at the house, you find it secluded within a high brick wall, and guarded at the gate by a durwan, or porter, who lives there in a lodge, less to prevent ingress than to see that servants and others carry nothing away improperly. The door is sheltered by a porch, called here a veranda, so constructed as to shelter carriages—a precaution equally necessary for the rains and the sun. The best houses are of two stories, the upper being occupied by the family, and the lower used for dining and store rooms. On every side are contrivances to mitigate heat and exclude dust. Venetian blinds inclose the veranda, extending from pillar to pillar, as low as a man's head. The remaining space is furnished with mats (tatties), which reach to the floor, when the sun is on that side, but at other times are rolled up. When these are kept wet they diffuse a most agreeable coolness.

‘ The moment you sit down, whether in a mansion, office, or shop, a servant commences pulling the punka, under which you may happen to be. The floor is of brick and mortar, covered with mats, the walls of the purest white, and the ceilings of great height. Both sexes, and all orders, dress in white cottons. The rooms are kept dark, and in the hottest part of the day shut up with glass. In short, every thing betrays a struggle to keep cool.’—Vol. ii. pp. 4—6.

We had marked several other passages for quotation, on account of the faithful portraiture of the manners and customs of



the natives presented in them, but we have already perhaps given these volumes a greater degree of attention than the relation they bear to our increasing literature warrants.

We have no wish to point out faults where the intention is so benevolent, and the general composition is so respectable; else we should spend a few critical remarks on the patois of New England, and a few vulgarisms which we know not how to classify. Perhaps they also are idiomatic to our trans-Atlantic brethren. Our author in the course of his volumes incidentally mentions a difficulty which he feels as it regards the etymology of the word Pagoda. He will perhaps permit us to inform him that, it is the corrupt Portuguese spelling of a Persian word by which, the Mahometans characterize the idol temples of the Hindus. The word (beet koda) literally signifies the house of the idol, and being pronounced in the manner in which we have endeavoured to represent it in roman letters, was easily corrupted by the Portuguese into the form in which we now use it. To all our readers wishing to have a general knowledge of our Indian empire, and especially to those who have an interest in the progress of our holy religion in that country, we heartily and strongly recommend these two volumes, as intrinsically valuable, and as embodying a mass of intelligence on India which so far as our information extends, will be sought in vain in an equal number of pages of any volumes of British Literature.

---

Art. VIII. 1. *Debate on Mr. Duncombe's Motion to relieve Dissenters from the Payment of Church Rates; February 11th. Report of Morning Chronicle.*

2. *The Whigs and the Dissenters. A Letter to Edward Baines, Esq., M.P.* London: Jackson and Walford.

**I**N a brief article on the Ecclesiastical Courts, inserted in our last number, we took occasion to admonish the Dissenters of Great Britain 'against that easy credence and implicit trust of men 'in office, which, as recently exhibited, has gone far to render us 'a laughing-stock to our neighbours.' We little thought when penning this passage, that events would so speedily occur to render further admonition on this subject unnecessary; that the debates of the Commons' House, within the short space of a fortnight from the publication of our advice, would place beyond all doubt, the ecclesiastical policy of her Majesty's present government, and the absurdity of looking for any enlightened and vigorous measure of relief at their hands. We wrote in the simple recollection of the

past, and with no unkindly feeling—as our remarks testify—to Lord Melbourne's administration. We might have our surmises, but we did not think it just to give them utterance. We were willing to exercise a generous, though not an unlimited confidence, and had our hopes—faint it may be, yet not wholly to be abandoned,—that the advocacy of religious liberty, so long the glory and the strength of the Whig party, would yet be adhered to, and be steadily followed up. We regret to say, and truth wrings from us the acknowledgment, that recent events have gone far to revolutionize our feelings, and to give a substantive form to the suspicions which had previously been floating in our minds. We do not, as Dissenters, regret the occurrence. It was just the lesson we needed, and it will not be without its benefits. It is painful to generous minds to have confidence in old friends shaken, but it is a thousand-fold better that this should occur, than that false hopes should be entertained, and our position be misunderstood.

We refer, as our readers will anticipate, to the debate which has recently taken place in the lower house, and more especially to the speech of Lord John Russell, the ministerial leader. To that debate we must now briefly direct attention, as its bearing on our interests as Dissenters—on our actual position and prospects—is more direct and important than any thing else which has occurred for some time past. It is not to the merits of the particular question mooted by Mr. Duncombe, that we now specifically refer, but to the whole tone and spirit of the opposition by which his motion was met by the ministerial leader; the cold-heartedness and want of all generous sympathy with suffering conscience, however erroneous that conscience might be deemed, which his lordship's speech evinced; the obvious effort to conciliate opponents, even at the expense of common courtesy to a body once professedly respected, and certainly much relied on in times of need; the new-born zeal rising to a flame under the stimulating influence of Tory cheers; the hauteur of the aristocrat mingling itself with the prejudices of the churchman, and, in combination, seeking an excuse for the abandonment of an effort deemed no longer needful for the retention of office, and the success of party warfare; the contempt, scarcely suppressed, yet never distinctly and honestly embodied in words;—these are the matters to which we refer, when expressing our conviction of the importance which attaches to the debate in question. It is as though his lordship were supremely concerned to disencumber himself of the confidence of the Dissenting body, yet was restrained by the mannerism of his rank from plainly telling them to be gone. Their intellects, if we mistake not, are sufficiently clear to understand his meaning, and he may yet find that they have complied with his desire.

Before proceeding to notice the prominent features of the debate, we wish to guard ourselves against a misconstruction, to which some of our remarks may possibly be liable. We find no fault with Lord John Russell for speaking as a churchman; it was natural that he should do so; we should not have respected him had he done otherwise. His views on this matter are well known, and have been often expressed, and we had no other expectation than to find him, on every befitting occasion, the advocate and zealous upholder of the endowed church. It would have been more than Utopian—the very height, in fact, of absurdity—to entertain any other expectation; and the Eclectic, at least, is free from the suspicion of having done so. So long since as August, 1837, we stated our conviction, that it was ‘idle for Dissenters to expect the administration should commit itself to the advocacy of their principles. ‘Lord Melbourne and his colleagues,’ we then remarked, ‘are members of the dominant church, and their propositions will, doubtless, respect its welfare, and be designed to strengthen its hold on the popular mind. We have no right to censure them on this account. With their principles and views such a procedure is perfectly befitting. It is honest in them to make the attempt, though we are satisfied that it will prove an utter failure.’\* Such are our recorded sentiments, and we adduce them on the present occasion, to guard ourselves from the suspicion of being influenced by the disappointment of unreasonable hopes, and the chagrin consequent thereon. What we complain of is, not that Lord John avowed himself a churchman, and showed himself to be but little acquainted with our principles; but that his opposition to a measure for our relief was conducted in the worst spirit of a Tory opponent; that the matter was not allowed a hearing, but was at once and heartily opposed, upon grounds and with professions which, if admitted, must rivet for ever an unrighteous and tyrannical impost, by which conscience is outraged, and the decencies of social life impaired. Gloss the matter as he may, the *animus* of his lordship’s speech was indicative of the abandonment of former pledges, and of a settled determination, on the part of himself and his colleagues, to encumber themselves no more with the advocacy of our rights. Well, let it be so. The friends of religious liberty have never suffered by being thrown on their own resources; and should his lordship’s policy but have the effect of driving us to a more thorough investigation and hearty confidence in our principles,—and such we believe will be its result—we shall have no cause for regret.

The bill which Mr. Duncombe asked permission to introduce, was entitled, ‘A bill to relieve from the payment of Church-

---

\* New Series, II., 213.



'rates that portion of her Majesty's subjects who conscientiously dissent from the rites or doctrines of the Established Church.' The first clause of the bill enacts that John Thorogood, and all other persons now imprisoned for non-payment of Church-rates, 'shall be immediately discharged.' The second prohibits the future incarceration of persons like-minded; and the third exempts from the payment of Church-rates, all persons who shall make 'before one or more of her Majesty's justices of the peace' the following declaration:—

'I A. B., do solemnly declare that I am not of the Communion of the Church of England as by law established, and that in my conscience I do dissent therefrom; and do also solemnly declare that in objecting to pay Church-rates, I do so from no pecuniary motives, but solely and sincerely for conscience sake.' It being however expressly enacted, 'that any person who shall have made the aforesaid declaration, and shall thereby have relieved himself from the payment of Church-rates, such person should be disqualified from voting or taking any part whatsoever in the proceeding of any vestry convened for the purpose of making or considering the propriety of making a Church-rate, or for any other matter or question connected with the support or maintenance of the Established Church.'

Such were the main features of the measure which the honorable member for Finsbury sought to introduce. Let us now look at the manner in which it was received. Immediately after the proposition had been seconded by Mr. Gillon, Lord John arose, and in what the *Times* calls a 'smart and sensible speech,' announced his opposition to it, as 'not founded on sound principles, and calculated to lead to dangerous consequences.' Many parts of his lordship's speech would have well befitted Sir Robert Inglis, or Lord Roden, but they sound strange from the lips of the noble member for Stroud. We pass by the cold-heartedness with which the case of John Thorogood is treated, and the sneer—so truly aristocratic and churchman-like—with which the poor man's assessment is referred to, and come to such parts of his lordship's oration, as assumed the character of reasoning. The mere fact of law is, of course, adduced as settling the question, so far as the prisoner is concerned; but we take leave to differ from his lordship, nor can we see how the following language is more conclusive, as used by Lord John in 1839, than it was in Queen Mary's time, when employed by Gardiner and Bonner, or in Charles II., when urged by Lord Chancellor Clarendon, and other advocates of a State Church. But let his lordship exhibit his own—or rather his adopted—argument.

'Much, therefore, as he (Lord J. Russell) thought of the hardship of John Thorogood's case, and believing as he did that he was a very

sincere person, and anxious only to do what his conscience dictated to him, he nevertheless did not think that there was sufficient in his case to justify the character given of it by the hon. gentleman. No doubt he was led by conscientious motives to support the voluntary principle. In his petition he declared that he believed the existence of a state church to be repugnant to the principles of the Holy Scriptures, and detrimental to the cause of religion; that he thought he ought not to contribute to its support; and that he, therefore, refused voluntarily to pay Church-rates. Now this might be a very conscientious opinion on the part of John Thorogood, but as long as that house recognized the laws by which a state religion was established in this country, and so long as such was the law, no individual was at liberty to disobey it.

If this reasoning be conclusive, on behalf of a protestant establishment, by what dialectic skill shall we evade its force when employed by a papist on behalf of his church, or by a Mahomedan on behalf of the mosque. It will not do to have one law for ourselves and another for an opponent. Our principles, to be conclusive, must hold in all analogous cases, and must be equally valid, however various the circumstances to which their application is required. Tried by this test, the argument of law is evidently untenable, and has consequently been abandoned by every party in its turn. There is, in truth, a primary question on which the whole turns, and on the settlement of which the decision of this controversy mainly hinges. That question respects the sacredness of conscience, the high obligations of religious duty, the responsibility under which we are held to consult the divine will in preference to the human, and to measure our obedience to the latter by the consistency of its requirements with the laws of the former.

We are well aware of the reply which will be made to this reasoning, nor are we ignorant of the fact that, it is held to be conclusive by many of our friends. If we admit, it will be urged, the right of an individual to refuse obedience on the ground of conscience, to any particular law; we open the door to all possible anarchy and confusion. Each one, according to the dictates of caprice, or the suggestions of self-interest, will be urging the same plea, and be demanding a similar exemption. One will except to one impost, and another to another, and thus all order will be destroyed, and the whole body politic be subverted. There is much seeming force in this objection, nor are we disposed to treat it lightly. On the contrary, we would give it the gravest consideration, and if it cannot be fairly met, we will honestly admit the untenableness of our position.

But we take leave to remark, that there is one simple principle capable of application to this case, which seems to us to settle the

moral of the question, and at the same time to guard effectually against the political evils which are apprehended from the admission of our views. That principle is based on the inherent and essential distinction between political and ecclesiastical legislation, between the laws of any human government,—whether monarchical, aristocratical, or democratic,—affecting the civil rights of its subjects, and those which assume to regulate their ecclesiastical affairs. In the former case government is absolute, its decision is final, and the duty of the subject is obedience,—in the latter case legislation is invalid *ab initio*, and has no other title to obedience than that which force supplies. In the one case, a rightful authority is exercised over a legitimate and recognized province, in the other an authority is usurped to the detriment of religion, and in defiance of the paramount claims of the God of truth. The beautiful axiom of our divine Master—so simple and at the same time so comprehensive—to render unto Cæsar the things which are Cæsar's, and unto God the things which are God's, is equally applicable to both these cases: enforcing a prompt compliance with the laws of the one, and a conscientious and high-minded refusal of subjection to the other. In civil matters the only question which an individual has to determine respects the *fact* of law. This being ascertained, his obedience must follow, not through fear, but 'for conscience sake.' But it is different in religion. He owes supreme subjection to God, and must regulate his conduct towards other and subordinate authorities, by the harmony of their requirements with his revealed will. To recognize an authority incompatible with the divine supremacy, is to fail in discharging the first duty of Christian faithfulness, and to encourage the encroachments of an anti-christian power, which 'opposeth and exalteth himself above all 'that is called God, sitting in the temple of God, showing himself 'that he is God.'

Such unhappily has been the conduct of the majority even of religious reformers in past times, and we need not say what perplexities and discords, what inconsistencies and wastings of strength, have followed in consequence. The enemy which ought to have been met on the frontier, has been permitted to establish himself in the very heart of the country, and the character of the struggle has thus been changed; its nobler features have been merged; and the vindication of truth, the assertion of heaven's high rights have been lost sight of, in the maintenance of a party warfare, and the defence of some isolated and unimportant posts. Let the validity of the plea urged by Lord John be once conceded, and the advocates of religious liberty are in a false position. There is no medium course. It is vain to inquire after, or to endeavour to discover one. We must take our stand on the cardinal principle we advocate, and refuse to admit the



validity and binding obligation of ecclesiastical legislation, or must be content to struggle, under manifest disadvantage, and with ever repeated failures, on behalf of what we deem the cause of God and truth.

We are not so ignorant of our times as to anticipate the speedy adoption of these views. We know them to be in advance of the day, and that they will be misunderstood and descried in many quarters, where better things might be expected. But we give them utterance, and wait patiently the issue. They will work their way, silently it may be, but still surely, till, the public mind being prepared for their reception, they will come forth with the majestic simplicity of truth, to point out, to a bewildered and agonized people, the secret of their strength, and the solemn requirement of their God. We find no fault with such of our brethren as refuse to adopt and act on our principles. With their views it would be wrong for them to do so. Let us co-operate so far as we are agreed, and where we differ, let us commend ourselves, and commend each other, to the guidance and controlling agency of the God of truth. May he by the inspiration of his Spirit correct every error into which either of us has fallen, and lead us to the faithful and diligent exhibition of the 'truth as it is 'in Jesus.'

We now recur to Lord John, whose reasoning was hailed with cheers from the Tory benches, which so stimulated his oratory as to induce his lordship to assure the house, 'He would go further than that, and declare his belief that the Established Church of England was founded *on just, wise, and fair principles.*' 'Here,' says the Examiner, and with this simile we shall dismiss his lordship's marvellous faith, 'we have before us the crow, the cheese, and the fox. At the first note of the crow, reynard is in raptures. He claps his paws, he wags his bushy tail in an ecstasy, he cries 'Bravo, bravissimo! what a voice! what execution! how he takes the C above the line!' Upon this, quoth the delighted crow, 'I can go farther than that, higher than that,' and he strains another harsh discord to the unbounded delight of reynard—but beware, oh Corby, lest you drop the cheese—it trembles in your mouth while you are indulging in those half-note shakes which make all your party shake, ay, and your opponents shake too, in other fashions—your friends with fear, and your foes with laughter.'

Having thus pandered to his opponents, Lord John proceeded to discuss the merits of Mr. Duncombe's proposition, and his reasoning is worthy of being placed on record.

'He (Lord John Russell) must at once say that he could not approve of this plan. In the first place, there was the obvious temptation to fraud by holding out a pecuniary benefit arising out of the

avowal of conscientious dissent. He could very well understand the admission of a declaration, where the object of it was to admit the person making it to a participation in equal privileges to those enjoyed by other persons in the realm. Such, for instance, as the declaration required of certain Protestants, in order to entitle them to the enjoyment of privileges enjoyed by other Protestants, or the declaration required of Roman Catholics, in order to entitle them to certain immunities and privileges granted to them by act of parliament. But in those cases the object was to entitle them to an equal share in benefits already enjoyed by others. In the present case, however, the person making the declaration would by so doing entitle himself to a greater benefit. As a member of the Established Church he would be obliged to pay the church-rate—to pay certain sums for the repairs of the churches: but if he declared himself a conscientious dissenter from the Established Church, then, by making a declaration to that effect, he could free himself from the pecuniary obligation. So with regard to this sum of 5s. 6d., which every man of equal station to John Thorogood in his parish would be compelled to pay by law, Thorogood according to the plan of the honorable gentleman, would be able to evade the payment by declaring himself a conscientious Dissenter. Here was obviously a pecuniary snare. A man might be ostensibly a member of the Established Church; but he might be a lukewarm member, or indifferent, yet the temptation was held out to him to relieve himself from the payment of the 5s. 6d. church-rate, by simply making a declaration that he conscientiously dissented from the doctrines of the Church.'

The distinction which his lordship thus attempted to draw between former declarations and that proposed in Mr. Duncombe's bill is clearly fallacious, since no such inequality as he alleges, would follow from the latter. All that Dissenters ask for is to be placed on the same level as their neighbours. More than this they would not accept—whatever Church-zealots may allege—and with less they will never be satisfied. How stands the case at present? why just thus. The Churchman has his religion furnished to him, and paid for, by the state, the Dissenter has to support his own. The contributions of the latter to religion are manifold more than the former;—in some cases ten times, in the most twenty times as much. And yet, while thus exerting himself on behalf of what he deems the most scriptural form of Christianity, he is called upon to contribute—yea is threatened with the seizure of his goods or the imprisonment of his person, if he does not contribute—to the repair of the church edifice, the washing of the clergyman's surplice, and the furnishing of the sacramental elements for its worshippers. If there be inequality in the world that inequality exists at present; if there be injustice—gross, crying injustice—it is found in this miserable impost, which is now defended from one end of the kingdom to the other, not for its

own sake, but as 'an outward and visible sign,' of the subjection of this kingdom to the rule of an antichristian and soul-deluding system. And yet there would be inequality in relieving men, who say—and their word is entitled to credence—that the assessment violates their conscience, and is repugnant to their sense of religious duty.' So reasons his lordship now, for a marvellous change has come over the spirit of his philosophy.

But the noble member for Stroud is distrustful of his own followers, and Sir Robert Inglis shares his alarm. These zealots for the church have so little confidence in the attachment of the people, so slighting a view of the hold of their venerable mother on the affection of her numerous offspring, that they are apprehensive of a general defection; a forsaking of her altars; a base apostasy from her, if the paltry inducement of a few shillings be proffered. We thank Lord John and the member for the Oxford University for the admission, and shall not forget it in the future discussions of the voluntary controversy. But his lordship attempted to enliven the debate by something of joke and pleasantry. His wit, however, was pointless, for it was founded in misconception and ignorance, and betrayed the bad *animus* of the speaker without aiding his cause.

'He for one,' remarked Lord John, 'would say, that he would be sorry to see the time when those who preached the gospel in this country would be obliged to look for support to the voluntary contributions of their congregations. He could understand, with regard to the lighter arts, the principle embodied in those lines of Dr. Johnson:—

'The drama's laws the drama's patrons give,  
For those who live to please must please to live.'

'But sorry would he be to hear that

'The pulpit's laws the pulpit's patrons give,  
And those who live to preach must preach to live.'

'Sorry, indeed, would he be if those who filled the pulpits now filled by members of the Established Church, were to become claimants on the voluntary contributions of their congregations, on the score of their being taking, eloquent, pleasing preachers.'

If this miserable witticism was intended to describe our *system*, it was low-minded, and utterly unworthy even of a second-rate debater; but if it were designed for our *ministers*, it was a gratuitous insult, and a gross libel. They are not the men this language would represent them to be, and his lordship knows them not to



be so.\* Poor they may be, or rather of limited possessions, but if there be one class of our countrymen more distinguished than any other, by moral courage and independence of character, they constitute that class. There may, doubtless there are, exceptions, but we speak of them as a whole, and no man who knows them will deny the truth of our assertion.

His lordship, it appears from the close of his speech, is prepared either to introduce, or to support a bill, transferring the cognizance of church-rate cases from the ecclesiastical to the civil courts, and providing that the payment of such rates should be proceeded for, 'against the goods and not against the person,' of the defaulter. Does his lordship think he could carry such a proposition through the Upper House; nay, is it quite certain, that it would be supported in the Commons, by a larger majority than that which sealed the fate of the last church-rate bill? We have our doubts, but let these rest; we do not expect to see his lordship make the trial. Such a suggestion might very well befit the close of such a speech, and there, we apprehend, the matter will end. Nor are we much concerned about it. We should, doubtless, as patriots, rejoice in the subversion of an incompetent, anomalous,

---

\* We learn from the *Patriot* of February the 20th, that the Dissenting constituents of his lordship have conveyed to him, in respectful but strong language, their sense of the injustice he has done to their religious teachers. At a public meeting of the members of various Dissenting congregations in the borough of Stroud, held February 17th, it was resolved to transmit to Lord John Russell the following Memorial, which we transcribe for the information of our readers, and as a model of temperate, but firm and dignified remonstrance. We should like to see how his lordship will reply.

'That this Meeting has learned with deep regret that Lord John Russell has not only refused to support a Bill for the liberation of John Thorogood from prison, and for relieving Dissenters from liability to pay Church-rates, but has also uttered in the House of Commons gratuitous insinuations against the independent character of the whole body of Dissenting Ministers.

'That these proceedings on the part of Lord John Russell are matter of much regret on many grounds:—First, because the insinuations in question are untrue; Dissenting Ministers, generally, being well known to be inferior to no class of Englishmen, either Lay or Clerical, in honesty or independence; and this Meeting feel assured that, had Lord John's connexions and prepossessions allowed him to become better acquainted with Dissenting Ministers, his opinion of them would have been widely different: Secondly, because Lord John Russell went altogether out of his way in instituting a comparison, on such an occasion, between the Ministers of different religious bodies; it being obvious, that if he deemed it expedient to avow his attachment to the State-Church, the avowal might have been made without any such invidious comparison: Thirdly, because this Meeting cannot but entertain the apprehension that the conduct and language of Lord John Russell, on the evening in question, will tend to alienate from him not merely numerous individuals in this Borough (which circumstance alone would be of small importance), but an immense body of Dissenters in every part of the island; whereby, it may be feared, the cause of civil and religious liberty will be damaged, and its enemies made to rejoice.'

and unconstitutional court, but the *gravamen* of our complaint would remain untouched.

On the whole we regret, as much on his lordship's account as on our own, the impression his speech has made. We would gladly rid ourselves of that impression, but we cannot do so. It abides upon us, and gathers depth and distinctness with every fresh perusal.

'On the case of Thorogood,' says the *Examiner*, and we cannot better describe our own feelings, 'Lord John Russell has delivered a speech of supreme *bon ton*, which, for the occasion at least, quite separates him from the *low party*, and wonderfully exalts him in the opinion of the high Church. The *Times* praises his Lordship's performance as 'smart and sensible;' but smart is not the word for it, it was dainty and disdainful. It was seasoned with contempt of weakness and poverty, and a lofty scorn of grievances. It was thus thoroughly aristocratic, and what in Tory coteries will be emphatically called gentlemanly. The speech indeed seems to have been made for recovery of the speaker's favor with his caste, and for his restoration to the bosom of the Church.'

Of the other speakers in this debate, honorable mention must be made of Mr. Hume, Mr. Baines, and Mr. Hawes. The first of these gentlemen told the ministerial leader some home truths, and specially contrasted the different treatment experienced by John Thorogood—a man poor, and therefore to be despised,—from that of the Scotch clergy, in their present struggle with the civil power.

'Was John Thorogood,' inquired Mr. Hume, 'the only man now doubting the laws and institutions of the country in regard to the church? What were one half of the clergy of Scotland doing at the present time? They laughed at the authority of the quarter sessions, and they defied the House of Lords. They claimed to act on conscientious scruples—they threw all other considerations on one side—and they were still determined to resist the intrusion of any person presented by the patrons of livings, and therefore as much entitled to those livings as the Church was to Church-rates. Why did not the noble lord grapple with those persons? Because John Thorogood was a poor shoemaker the noble lord had no sympathy for him, but he did entertain sympathy for the clergy in Scotland. He would tell the house the reason why. John Thorogood was a single and simple individual, but the Scottish clergy formed a powerful party, who were tearing the country up. Indeed proceedings were going on which were disgraceful to the country. He (Mr. Hume) maintained that those proceedings were doing as much hurt to the church as ever John Frost had done to the state. Their language was as violent, and their proceedings were in defiance of the law. What more had John Frost done, or any of the leaders of the Chartists?

They had not done so much in openly defying the law, and exhorting thousands to defy it, as these persons had done. He repeated that the noble lord sympathized with the Scotch clergy because they were powerful, but he did not sympathize with John Thorogood because he was poor and humble. The noble lord abolished Church-rates in Ireland—why? Because he could not help it.'

Of the part taken by Dr. Lushington in this debate, we cannot too strongly express our regret, and we call upon him to reconcile it with his former professions, more especially with some which we have received from himself, on the eve of a contested election. Ranking among his constituents, and believing him, up to the limit of his convictions, to be an honest and consistent politician, we have labored zealously on his behalf. It was therefore with no little surprise, that we read his speech on this occasion, and our surprise was any thing but diminished, when his own words in April last, recurred to our memory. Speaking at that period, on Mr. Hawes's motion, Dr. Lushington affirmed, 'The abolition of these courts is necessary on three grounds; first, for the sake of justice; secondly, for the sake of their own character; and thirdly, for the sake of religion itself, which they tend, day after day, to desecrate and debase!' It may be possible to reconcile these, to harmonize his present conduct with such past declarations, but we confess our incompetency to the task; and wait till the proper time comes to ask our representatives—for Mr. Clay voted also in the majority—to vindicate themselves from the charge of having betrayed our interests.

Our strictures on the debate have extended beyond our design, and have left us little space for some remarks which we are desirous of addressing to our dissenting readers. Our position is manifestly different from what it was a few years since; whether better or worse is another matter, and different views will, probably, be entertained on this point. Our own opinion is the former, and our reason for thinking so is this;—the course of events has been for some time past disengaging us *as dissenters* from that political partizanship to which we have been so prone, and from which some of our number have entertained very delusive hopes. Our efforts have consequently been misdirected. We have lost sight of the legitimate and accessible sphere of our operation, and have expended our strength on unpractical and utopian schemes. Rising from the depression consequent on a long period of Tory domination, and feeling our importance in the party struggles of the day, we have imagined that we could barter our services for the concession of our rights; that we could obtain, as the reward of our zealous cooperation with the Whig ministry, the overthrow of the strongholds of prelatical usurpation and Church power. The supposition was not unnatural. It was



the sudden growth of our altered circumstances and augmented power, and for a time it has deluded and misled us. A little reflection, a little forethought, a little reading of the past, a little attention to the dove-tailing of parties, and the thousand ramifications of Church influence around us, would have sufficed to prevent the blunder. But so it was, and we gave ourselves to the delusion; trusted to statesmen rather than to principles; and looked for the triumph of our cause from the friendly disposition of political partizans, rather than to the omnipotence of truth, and the promised aid of the God of Heaven. *Experientia docet*, says the old proverb, and in our case it has proved true.

Our first duty at the present moment is, calmly, and in a religious temper, to review our position; to retrace our course for the past few years, marking its wisdom and its folly, its successes and its failures. We shall thus gather up much invaluable instruction, and be better prepared for the right direction of our future efforts. We must reconsider our principles, and determine—solemnly and prayerfully determine—whether they are worthy of the homage they claim, whether they merit the sacrifices they demand, whether, in a word, they bear the impress of the Divine mind, and may be cherished, and their diffusion be sought, as the discharge of a sacred and responsible trust. These are not times for hesitancy, and doubt, and half-heartedness. We must be men of action, with our principles well fixed, and thoroughly understood, and with all our aspirations and sympathies in hallowed harmony with them. A protracted discussion is before us, which will tax our decision to the utmost, and it is therefore the dictate of common prudence, to say nothing of the higher requirements of Christian duty, that we sit down and soberly count the cost. Having made up our minds on the merit of the ‘great argument’ in debate, we must be prepared, ‘in simplicity and with godly sincerity,’ to follow it out to its legitimate and practical issues, regardless of the counsels of timid friends, and spurning the suggestions of a temporizing and heartless expediency.

In the particular question of Church-rates, our whole policy must be changed, and the sooner it is so the better. The appeal we have made to parliament has been met by resistance and reproach, and it were folly to expect the administration of the day to urge its adoption any further. Account for the fact as we may, it is now placed beyond all question, that the strength of political parties is too nearly balanced to allow of the remotest hope of success in this quarter. But there is another and more legitimate sphere where our principles may be advocated, and our claim for exemption be enforced. It would have been wiser to have confined ourselves to this from the first, but we are now shut up to it by the course of events, and the whole bent of our policy should be directed to its successful occupation. We refer, as our

readers will anticipate, to the parish vestry, where the law allows a free expression of opinion, and authorizes a rate only on the vote of a majority. We are aware of the strong aversion felt by many dissenters, to an attendance at such vestries, and for many years we sympathized with it, and abstained in consequence from joining with our neighbours on these annual occasions. Increasing reflection, however, has convinced us of the impropriety of the feeling in question, and we now purpose, and exhort the dissenters of Great Britain to join with us in the resolution, to avail ourselves of the opportunity which the constitution gives to resist an impost which, being founded in injustice, violates the laws of Christian charity, and tramples conscience in the dust. What Sir Robert Peel said in reference to the registration courts, may with equal propriety and force be applied to the parish vestry. It is *here* that the battle of religious liberty must be fought, and thanks be unto God, it may be fought in security and with triumph. A large number of the parishes of the kingdom have already succeeded in resisting the impost, and it requires but organization, and forethought, and mutual concession, to increase the number tenfold.

One great advantage will most certainly be gained by such a procedure, whatever doubt may accompany the attainment of others. We shall have an opportunity of stating, in the presence, and within the hearing of our opponents, what our principles are, and of showing the appearance of support which—to say the least—they obtain from the legislation of Christ, and the practice of his inspired apostles. The parish vestry is the only opportunity we possess of coming into contact with those from whom we differ. They will not read our publications, they do not attend our lectures, they are shut up within a circle where the dissenting advocate is not permitted to enter, but where prejudice, and misrepresentation, and a thousand forms of apprehended danger, haunt their imaginations and steel their hearts against us. Hence then the desirableness—yea, the solemn obligation—of meeting them once a year, to expound the verities of God's book, and to vindicate the insulted supremacy of our Lord.

Moreover, it should be borne in mind that, on these occasions, we meet our neighbours and daily associates, men by whom we are known, and who can testify respecting us whether our manner of living be such, as to entitle us to urge the sacred plea of conscience. It may do well for the infuriated disputant to dip his pen in gall, and to describe us to his fellows as rebels in politics, and atheists in religion; but the men who meet us face to face, and are acquainted with our daily life, will do justice to our integrity, even though they remain unconvinced by our arguments. At any rate, we shall have delivered our own souls, and borne an honorable testimony on behalf of neglected and insulted truth.

Should any Dissenters be still disposed to urge their disin-

clination to attend the vestry, on account of the stormy discussions which sometimes occur, we take leave to remind them, that the courtesies of the gentleman, and the mild temper of our holy faith, need not be relinquished on such occasions. We would have Dissenters to be present, and to speak openly and without reserve; but we would have them, at the same time, to maintain a dignified deportment becoming the advocate of truth; never damaging their cause by an irritable and petulant temper, nor shading the mild lustre of their principles by the fumes of an unsanctified and worldly passion. We know some neighbourhoods in which Dissenters are sufficiently numerous to prevent the passing of a rate, could they be induced to give their attendance at the vestry; but this they have hitherto refused. Whether their motives are creditable or otherwise, we shall not now stop to inquire. One thing, however, is apparent, and to this we beg their candid and most serious attention. Some of their brethren, whose conscience is touched on this matter, are, in consequence of *their* remissness, subjected to an impost, the payment of which they feel bound,—erroneously, it may be, but still honestly bound—to refuse. If all Dissenters had attended, the necessity for this would not have occurred; and is there not, therefore, a disregard of the claims of the Christian brotherhood; a violation of the law of Christian love; a practical setting at naught of our Saviour's rule, 'to do unto others as we would have others do unto us,' in their procedure? Brethren, we are in no mood to censure, but we commend this case to your considerate and prayerful attention. Look it fairly in the face; consult the word of God, invoke the guidance of Infinite Wisdom, and then say whether you are not bound, on every occasion, and by every legitimate means within your power, to protect your brethren, fellow-heirs with you of 'the grace of eternal life,' from the spoiling of their goods, and the imprisonment of their person.

There is another topic to which we must briefly refer before we close, inferior to none in practical importance, and calling for prompt and judicious measures. Our cause has been seriously damaged by the appearances of division which have recently shown themselves among us. The author of the letter to Mr. Baines refers to these, yet not exactly in the way we could have wished. His praise and his censure are too general and indiscriminate. The case does not admit of the simple and easy settlement which he attempts, but requires a patient investigation of many facts, requiring larger space than we can now devote to the subject. It is we believe the fact,—and we give not utterance to a hasty judgment, nor one formed on a limited knowledge—that a feeling of mistrust, a want, at least, of thorough confidence in London committees, and London management, does prevail extensively in the country. We are not surprised that such should be the case, and are persuaded that, if the position of



the two parties were changed, the same state of things would substantially exist. Our brethren in the country, flushed with their local victories, and confident in their strength, have no adequate conception of the difficulties which have encompassed their London representatives. They have, consequently, attributed to supineness, to negligence, to treachery, what was the inevitable result of the ill-digested schemes and premature efforts which have been made. Want of success has been traced to want of fidelity, and hard words and uncharitable surmises have been uttered. We confess that it was with feelings of bitter sorrow, we read some time since, the report of a public meeting held at Leicester. We refrain to comment on the language uttered, on that occasion, by a reverend speaker — language involving in one sweeping condemnation, men whose services in the cause of religious liberty, have been a hundred-fold more abundant than those of their traducer. It is not often that such wholesale condemnation contains much truth,—still less is it characterised by the discrimination and candor in which honorable men delight. It would, to say the least, have better befitted the character of a modest man to have done something himself, before he ventured so authoritatively to denounce all others.

Let it not be supposed that we are believers in the infallibility of London committees or of London 'leaders,' if we must have the term. Far from it; our pages bear witness to the contrary. There has been too much of mere Whiggery, too much of the leaven of ministerial influence among us. Our energies have been depressed by political partizanship. There has been a want of open, manly expression of opinion; an unworthy attempt to wrap up our principles in ambiguous phraseology, and to merge the advocacy of truth in the effort to obtain redress of our practical grievances. Many things have happened in this great city to prove that wisdom doth not dwell here pre-eminently, but we are in no mood to follow out the details of such a matter. We say rather, let there be a friendly conference, that past misconceptions may be corrected; false impressions be mutually removed; the objects at which we are to aim be clearly defined; and the whole machinery of our future operation be sketched out and settled. These are not times in which brethren should be content to mistrust, much less to defame and caricature each other. There is wisdom in the country, there is zeal in town. Neither can claim a monopoly of either of these qualities, nor can a more serious damage be done to our cause—the cause, be it remembered, of evangelical truth, of Christ's rightful sovereignty—than by leading us to suspect each other, and to refuse in consequence that cordial co-operation, for which the identity of our spirit and principles fits us, and in which our opponents will be wise enough to discern the certain omen of our approaching triumph.

## Brief Notices.

*A Dictionary, Geographical, Statistical, and Historical, of the Various Countries, Places, and Principal Natural Objects in the World.* By J. R. McCulloch, Esq. 8vo. Part I. London: Longman and Co.

We need not say one word to dispose the public for a favorable reception of this work. The established reputation of the author supersedes the necessity of our doing so, and we shall, therefore, content ourselves with a brief extract from his prospectus, and a promise to report progress from time to time. 'It is necessary to observe, that we have not attempted to supply the reader with a complete Geographical and Statistical Dictionary. Such a work would necessarily extend to many volumes, and would embrace multitudinous details nowise interesting to the great majority of readers. Our object has been of a more limited kind. Being intended for the especial use of Englishmen, we have dwelt at greatest length on those articles, and on those parts of articles, we thought most likely to interest them. Hence we have appropriated a much larger space to articles connected with our Eastern possessions, and our colonies in different parts of the world, than they may appear, on other grounds, properly entitled to. On the same principle, we have lengthened the accounts of those countries and places with which our countrymen have the greatest intercourse, or which have acquired celebrity by the historical associations connected with them; and have proportionally shortened the others.' The work is to appear in monthly parts, and will be 'confined within the smallest possible compass.'

---

*Emendations of the Authorized Version of the Old Testament.* By Selig Newman, Author of the 'Abridged Hebrew Grammar,' and the 'Complete Hebrew and English Lexicon.' Pp. 72. London: Wertheim. 1839.

Whatever objections may be made against a new version of the Bible which should supplant the version in general use, no well grounded objection can be urged against its defects or inaccuracies being pointed out, for the benefit of those whose inclination and profession lead them to study the original. And if, in such examination and comparison of the English with the Hebrew, we avail ourselves of the labors of German rationalists, we may surely hail those of the Israelitish believer, though not yet converted to Christianity. Mr. Newman does not appear before the public now for the first time; his Hebrew Grammar and Lexicon are well known, and have received from us the commendation they deserve. The work now before us will be found useful by those for whom it is intended. The authorized version of the passages handled, is put in one column, and the amended

version opposite. There is, of course, no room in so small a volume for discussing or defending the version proposed; still the work will be useful as showing the *opinion* entertained by a good Hebrew scholar and a student of the Hebrew Scriptures, on many obscure or difficult passages.

---

*The Mysteries of Revelation, no solid Argument against its Truth. A Dissertation which obtained the Hulsean Prize, for 1838. By Daniel Moore, Librarian and Scholar of Catherine Hall. Cambridge. 1839, pp. 115.*

Some of our readers may not be aware that in 1777, the Rev. John Hulse directed that one sixth part (of a certain portion of his rentals) 'should be paid to such learned and ingenious person, in the University of Cambridge, under the degree of Master of Arts, as shall compose for that year, the best Dissertation in the English language, on the Evidences in general, or on the Prophecies, or Miracles in particular, or any other particular argument, whether the same be direct or collateral proofs of the Christian Religion, in order to evince its truth and excellence.' The Essay before us obtained the prize for 1838; no small distinction, when we recollect the competition is open to the whole University.

It is a masterly production, discovering no small share of diligent investigation, polemical aptitude, and general attainment. The style is chaste and beautiful, without any lack of energy; and there is a tone of deep earnestness pervading the whole composition, which, without violating the proprieties of scientific discussion, throws the charm of sincerity, the hallowed lustre of a reflected experience, over the whole dissertation. The present essay must not be considered as a mere college exercise. Considering the argument well sustained throughout, we cordially recommend the publication to the perusal of any of our friends who wish for a clear, able, and concise view of a difficult and important subject.

---

*The British and Foreign Anti-Slavery Reporter. Under the Sanction of the British and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society. No. 1.*  
*The African Colonizer. No. 1.*

We are desirous of calling the early attention of our readers to both these Journals, each of which in its appropriate sphere, is eminently adapted to serve the interests of an enlightened and humane policy. They are both designed to appear once a fortnight, and may be ordered through any news-vender, so as to be obtained with the utmost regularity. The former 'will be devoted exclusively to topics connected with the twin abominations yet desolating the earth—Slavery and the Slave-Trade. It will also be the official organ of the British and Foreign Anti Slavery Society, and the habitual Reporter of its proceedings; maintaining, consequently, unequivocally, the *pacific* principles of that Society. Our columns,' remarks the editor, 'will con-



tain further, as much of the general information which will be continually arriving on our appropriate topics, as we may be able to condense into them ; together with original articles on the various important questions which will naturally arise for discussion. While the *Anti-Slavery Reporter* cannot be considered as in any way (the mere accident of time excepted) succeeding to the *British Emancipator*, from which its general scope and character will be found to differ, it will not be forgetful of the happily emancipated population of the British Colonies, a watchful regard to whose interests is one of the specific duties of the Anti-Slavery Society.'

The *African Colonizer*, has a more circumscribed, but scarcely less important sphere. It is 'published, not only under a strong impression that the affairs of Africa, generally, are of deep concern to Great Britain, but, under a still stronger conviction that some of the most dearly cherished British interests will incur the greatest hazard, if steps be not speedily taken to enlighten and rouse the public respecting British Africa in particular. Although, within a few months, attention has been called to Colonial topics with great ability ; and praiseworthy efforts are making for the same object in other periodicals, it is quite plain that space must always be wanting in them for the details indispensable to be PUBLISHED in order to get justice for Africa.' It is, therefore, proposed to make the *Colonizer* a depository of every kind of information bearing on the interests—whether moral, social, commercial, or political—of Africa, and thereby to secure from the British people that degree of attention to which this interesting but neglected portion of our globe is entitled. We heartily wish success to both Journals, and shall be forward, from time to time, to repeat our commendation.

---

*Prince Albert, His Country and Kindred.* London : Ward and Co.

A well-timed and meritorious publication which will be sought with eagerness, and be read with deep interest by a large class of our countrymen.

---

## Literary Intelligence.

### *Preparing for Publication.*

What Cheer? or Roger Williams in Banishment ; a Poem. By Job Durfee, Esq., with a recommendatory Preface by the Rev. John Eustace Giles, Leeds.

### *Just Published.*

Travels in the West. Cuba ; with Notices of Porto Rico and the Slave-Trade. By David Turnbull, Esq., M.A.

Discourses on Special Occasions, by the late Rev. Robert S. M'All, LL.D. With a Sketch of his Life and Character, by the Rev. Ralph Wardlaw, D.D. Two volumes 8vo.

Biblical Antiquities, and the Hebrew Commonwealth. By John Jahn, D.D. One volume.

History of Ireland. By Thomas Moore, Esq. Vol. III. (Lardner's Cyclopædia.)

Ward's Library. Christian Moderation. In two books. By Joseph Hall, D.D. Reprinted from the edition of 1640.

An Historical Sketch of the Law of Copyright ; with Remarks on Serjeant Talfourd's Bill ; and an Appendix of the Copyright Laws of Foreign Nations. By John J. Lowndes, Esq.

Historical Sketch of the Rise, Progress, and Decline of the Reformation in Poland, and of the Influence which the Scriptural doctrines have exercised on that Country, in Literary, Moral, and Polical respects. By Count Valerian Krasinski. Vol. II.

A Greek and English Lexicon to the New Testament : especially adapted for the Use of Colleges and Schools : but also intended as a convenient Manual for Students in Divinity and Theological Readers in General. By the Rev. S. T. Bloomfield, D.D.

The Cottage among the Mountains. A Narrative of peculiarly interesting Facts. By the Author of 'Conversations on Mind and Matter.'

The Fathers and Founders of the London Missionary Society ; with a brief Sketch of Methodism, and Historical Notices of the Several Protestant Missions from 1556 to 1839. By John Morison, D.D. 2 vols.

Prince Albert, His Country and Kindred.

A Dictionary Geographical, Statistical, and Historical, of the Various Countries, Places, and Principal Natural Objects in the World. By J. R. M'Culloch, Esq. Part I.

A Treatise on Man's Responsibility. By J. Howard Hinton, M.A.

The Primitive Doctrine of Justification Investigated : relatively to the several definitions of the Church of Rome and the Church of England ; and with a Special Reference to the Opinions of the late Mr. Knox, as published in his Remains. By George S. Faber, B.D. Second edition.

The Primitive Doctrine of Regeneration : Sought for in Holy Scripture ; and investigated through the medium of the Written Documents of Ecclesiastical Antiquity. By George S. Faber, B.D.

Narrative of a Journey from Caunpoor to the Boorendo Pass in the Himalaya Mountains. By Major Sir William Lloyd. And Captain Alexander Gerard's Account of an Attempt to penetrate by Bekhur, to Garoo, and the Lake Manasarowara, &c. Edited by George Lamb. 2 vols. 8vo.

Improvement of Affliction : A Practical Sequel to a Series of Meditations, entitled 'Comfort in Affliction.' By the Rev. James Buchanan.

A Treatise on Baptism ; designed as a Help to the due Improvement of that Holy Sacrament, as administered in the Church of England. By the Rev. E. Bickersteth.

Agathos, and other Sunday Stories. By a Clergyman.

Every Day Duties : In Letters to a Young Lady. By M. A. Stodart.

The Fountain of Life, or the Union between Christian Believers. By the Rev. Thomas Jones.

Outlines of Church History. By the Author of 'Early Recollections.'

Memoir of the Rev. Rowland Hill, M.A. By William Jones. With a Preface by the Rev. James Sherman. Second edition.

The Christian Visitor : or Select portions from The Acts of the Apostles and the Epistles, with Expositions and Prayers. Designed to assist the Friends of the Sick and the Afflicted. By the Rev. W. Jowett, M.A.